

BREAKING THE M-WAVES

JOSÉ MIGUEL FIGUEROA-O'FARRILL

ABSTRACT. We present a systematic attempt at classification of supersymmetric M-theory vacua with zero flux; that is, eleven-dimensional lorentzian manifolds with vanishing Ricci curvature and admitting covariantly constant spinors. We show that there are two distinct classes of solutions: static spacetimes generalising the Kaluza–Klein monopole, and non-static spacetimes generalising the supersymmetric wave. The classification can be further refined by the holonomy group of the spacetime. The static solutions are organised according to the holonomy group of the spacelike hypersurface, whereas the non-static solutions are similarly organised by the (lorentzian) holonomy group of the spacetime. These are subgroups of the Lorentz group which act reducibly yet indecomposably on Minkowski spacetime. We present novel constructions of non-static vacua consisting of warped products of d -dimensional pp -waves with $(11-d)$ -dimensional manifolds admitting covariantly constant spinors. Our construction yields local metrics with a variety of exotic lorentzian holonomy groups. In the process, we write down the most general local metric in $d \leq 5$ dimensions describing a pp -wave admitting a covariantly constant spinor. Finally, we also discuss a particular class of supersymmetric vacua with nonzero four-form obtained from the previous ones without modifying the holonomy of the metric. This is possible because in a lorentzian spacetime a metric which admits parallel spinors is not necessarily Ricci-flat, hence supersymmetric backgrounds need not satisfy the equations of motion.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
Note added in proof	4
2. Statement of the problem and holonomy analysis	4
2.1. A brief review of eleven-dimensional supergravity	4
2.2. Holonomy classification of known solutions	7
2.3. Lorentzian holonomy groups	11
3. Supersymmetric gravitational pp -waves	12
3.1. Brinkmann metrics with parallel spinors	12
3.2. Supersymmetric Brinkmann waves in $d \leq 5$	14
3.3. The Bryant metrics for $d = 11$ and $d = 10$	19
4. Lifting the Brinkmann waves	21

4.1. Warped products and Brinkmann waves	22
4.2. The holonomy group of a warped product	22
4.3. Some metrics with holonomy in Table 2	25
4.4. Ricci-flatness: building the M-wave	28
5. An explicit example: the Nappi–Witten wave	30
5.1. The Nappi–Witten geometry	30
5.2. Lifting the Nappi–Witten background	34
6. Some solutions with $F \neq 0$	34
6.1. Supersymmetric bosonic vacua with nonzero flux	35
6.2. Adding a gravitino	37
7. Conclusions and open problems	37
Acknowledgements	38
Appendix A. Some exotic lorentzian holonomy groups	39
A.1. An explicit real realisation of $\mathrm{Cl}(1, 10)$	39
A.2. The spinor isotropy group G	41
A.3. The group G as Lorentz transformations	42
A.4. Some relevant subgroups of G	42
References	44

1. INTRODUCTION

An important aspect of modern string theory is the study of its supersymmetric solitons. In the appropriate limit this involves the study of solutions to the equations of motion of the relevant supergravity theory, and in particular of those solutions which are left invariant by some of the supersymmetries. By now a large class of solutions are known, including waves, monopoles and branes; but as no systematic study has yet been undertaken, it is hard to estimate how much of the space of all supersymmetric solutions do the known ones comprise.

This seems to us an interesting question to address and in this paper we start such a systematic analysis, focusing as a first step on purely gravitational supersymmetric solutions; although later in the paper we will also discuss vacua with nonzero flux. As we will review briefly below supersymmetric bosonic vacua with zero flux are given by Ricci-flat lorentzian manifolds admitting covariantly constant spinors. We will see that there are two classes of solutions, depending on whether or not the spacetime admits a covariantly constant time-like vector. Those spacetimes which do are static and can be understood as generalisations of the Kaluza–Klein monopole. Their classification reduces (up to discrete quotients) to the classification of 10-dimensional riemannian manifolds with holonomy contained in $\mathrm{SU}(5)$, i.e., to the classification of Calabi–Yau 5-folds. The second class of solutions consists of spacetimes which are not static, but which nevertheless have a covariantly

constant light-like vector. They can be understood as supersymmetric gravitational *pp*-waves. This second type of solutions will be the main focus of this paper. We will present a new class of supersymmetric waves. The simplest examples preserve half of the supersymmetry and are built as warped products of gravitational plane waves and flat euclidean space. Replacing euclidean space by any manifold admitting covariantly constant spinors, one obtains other solutions which preserve a smaller fraction of the supersymmetry. These solutions are purely gravitational and possess null isometries. As we will see, they owe their existence to some exotic holonomy groups which lorentzian spacetimes can possess.

For definiteness, we will only consider eleven-dimensional supergravity, the low-energy limit of M-theory, by which we mean the strong coupling limit of type IIA superstring theory. This is a relatively simple supergravity theory which yields many of the lower dimensional supergravity theories after dimensional reduction. Many of the supersymmetric solutions of the other supergravity theories can be obtained from those of eleven-dimensional supergravity via a mixture of dimensional reduction, dualities and dimensional oxidation. Therefore it represents only a minor loss of generality to focus our attention on this theory, and in fact much of what we will say will generalise to other supergravity theories.

In summary, the purpose of this paper is then to study a class of spacetimes corresponding to gravitational waves possessing a covariantly constant spinor. These spacetimes possess a covariantly constant null vector, hence they are special cases of the spacetimes discussed by Brinkmann in the 1920s. We will focus primarily on a class of solutions which can be understood as lifts to eleven dimensions of lower dimensional *pp*-waves admitting parallel spinors. We will write down the most general local metric for such *pp*-waves in $d \leq 5$ dimensions, and we will investigate their lifts to supersymmetric vacua of M-theory preserving a fraction of the supersymmetry that can be easily computed. As an illustration of the construction we will work out one example in detail, corresponding to the lift to eleven dimensions of the Nappi–Witten plane wave [18].

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we briefly review eleven-dimensional supergravity and recast the problem of finding supersymmetric vacua in geometrical terms. The possible vacua can be organised according to their holonomy group and we give two tables of such holonomy groups with the fraction of supersymmetry preserved in each case. Some of the holonomy groups appearing in the tables may not be familiar, so we also briefly discuss lorentzian holonomy groups at the end of that section. Also in an appendix to the paper we discuss in detail the relevant lorentzian holonomy groups. In Section 3 we discuss some relevant facts about *pp*-waves, i.e., spacetimes

admitting null parallel vectors, and in particular about supersymmetric *pp*-waves: the subclass also admitting parallel spinors. We write down the most general local metric describing a supersymmetric *pp*-wave in dimension $d \leq 5$. We also review Bryant's recent construction of the most general local metric in eleven dimensions which admits a parallel null spinor (see below). Bryant's construction in principle solves the problem of constructing the most general supersymmetric M-theory vacuum with vanishing four-form; but since the result is not constructive, it is useful to have explicit constructions of such vacua. In Section 4 we discuss a method of constructing such vacua, consisting in the lift to eleven dimensions of a lower-dimensional *pp*-wave admitting parallel spinors. We discuss the lifting of such a d -dimensional *pp*-wave to eleven dimensions. Examples of Bryant's metrics possessing (conjecturally) all possible holonomy groups of M-waves are given by warping a three-dimensional supersymmetric *pp*-wave with an appropriate eight-dimensional manifold. In Section 5 we discuss one such example in detail: the four-dimensional Nappi–Witten plane wave. We discuss its geometry, compute its holonomy and prove that it admits parallel spinors, despite having non-vanishing Ricci curvature. We then lift the Nappi–Witten geometry to eleven dimensions by warping it with an appropriate seven-dimensional manifold. The resulting metric solves the supergravity equations of motion and preserves a fraction of the supersymmetry which can be as much as $\frac{1}{2}$ and as little as $\frac{1}{16}$, depending on the holonomy of the seven-manifold. In Section 6 we investigate the possibility of adding a nonzero four-form to the metrics constructed above while still satisfying the equations of motion and preserving some supersymmetry. We will see this is possible for most of the metrics constructed above. Finally in Section 7 we offer some concluding remarks and point out some open questions.

NOTE ADDED IN PROOF

After this preprint had been circulated and submitted to the archive, we became aware of the paper [16] by Lidsey, who also considers building eleven-dimensional Ricci-flat spacetimes by embedding a wide class of lower-dimensional *pp*-waves.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HOLONOMY ANALYSIS

In this section we set up the problem. In order to do so we start with a brief review of eleven-dimensional supergravity. We then recast the search for purely gravitational bosonic vacua as the problem of constructing Ricci-flat metrics with prescribed holonomy. We discuss the holonomy classification of supersymmetric vacua.

2.1. A brief review of eleven-dimensional supergravity. The arena of eleven-dimensional supergravity [17, 7] is a manifold M with a

metric g of signature 10+1 and a spin structure. From now on, we will call such a manifold simply a lorentzian spin manifold, leaving its dimension implicitly equal to eleven, unless otherwise stated. Apart from the metric, the other fields in the theory are a closed 4-form F , which is given locally in terms of a 3-form potential A by $F = dA$, and the gravitino ψ . In this paper we will only be interested in bosonic vacua, for which the gravitino vanishes: $\psi = 0$; although some comments will be made in Section 6.2 about the general case. The bosonic part of the action is given by a sum of three terms: an Einstein–Hilbert term, a generalised Maxwell term and a Chern–Simons term, as follows:

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int d^{11}x \sqrt{-g} R - \frac{1}{4} \int F \wedge \star F - \frac{1}{12} \int A \wedge F \wedge F . \quad (1)$$

We could also add a gravitational Chern–Simons term

$$\frac{1}{2} \int A \wedge X_8 , \quad (2)$$

where the closed 8-form X_8 is given by

$$X_8 = \frac{1}{192} \text{tr} R^4 - \frac{1}{768} (\text{tr} R^2)^2 ; \quad (3)$$

but we will ignore this term in what follows, as it is a higher order correction.

The generalised Maxwell equations following from the action are

$$d \star F = -\frac{1}{2} F \wedge F , \quad (4)$$

which together with the Bianchi identity $dF = 0$ specify F . The equation of motion for the metric is the generalised Einstein–Maxwell equation:

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{ab} = \frac{1}{6} T_{ab}(F) , \quad (5)$$

where the energy-momentum tensor of the Maxwell field is given by

$$T_{ab}(F) = F_{acde} F_b{}^{cde} - \frac{1}{8} g_{ab} F_{cdef} F^{cdef} . \quad (6)$$

(Notice that in eleven dimensions it is not traceless. In fact it is traceless only in eight dimensions, where there can be dyonic objects contributing to T_{ab} .)

With the gravitino set to zero, the supersymmetry variations of the bosonic fields vanish automatically. This means that the conditions for preservation of supersymmetry is simply that the supersymmetry variation of the gravitino should remain zero. This is equivalent to the existence of spinors ε which are parallel (i.e., covariantly constant) with respect to a generalised connection

$$\hat{\nabla}_a \varepsilon \equiv \nabla_a \varepsilon - \theta_a(F) \cdot \varepsilon = 0 , \quad (7)$$

where¹ $\nabla_a = \partial_a - \frac{1}{4}\omega_a^{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\Gamma_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}$ is the spin connection, and $\theta_a(F)$ is the F -dependent part of the connection:

$$\theta_a(F) \equiv \frac{1}{288}F_{bcde}(\Gamma_a^{bcde} - 8\delta_a^b\Gamma^{cde}) . \quad (8)$$

The connection $\hat{\nabla}$ is a very different object from the spin connection ∇ . As its name indicates, ∇ only depends on how ε transforms under the spin group. This is evident from the fact that its Γ matrix dependence is only through $\Gamma_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}$, which are the infinitesimal generators of $\text{Spin}(10,1)$. In contrast, $\hat{\nabla}$ depends on terms containing antisymmetrised products of three and five Γ matrices. Therefore, whereas the connection ∇ takes values in the spin subalgebra of the Clifford algebra $\text{Cl}(10,1)$, the connection $\hat{\nabla}$ takes values in the Clifford algebra itself. We therefore refer to it as a *Clifford connection*. The Clifford connection, unlike the spin connection, is not related to a connection on the tangent bundle, which makes its analysis much more complicated.

As a first step we will therefore set $F = 0$ in this paper and study the possible supersymmetric bosonic solutions to the resulting equations of motion. Later in Section 6 we will relax this condition and investigate whether it is possible to add F to solutions already found. From equation (5), it follows that bosonic solutions with $F = 0$ correspond to lorentzian spin manifolds with vanishing Ricci curvature: $R_{ab} = 0$. From equation (7) such a solution will preserve supersymmetry if in addition the spacetime admits parallel spinors relative to the spin connection. In other words, in geometrical terms, we have that purely gravitational supersymmetric solutions of eleven-dimensional supergravity are in one-to-one correspondence with eleven-dimensional lorentzian spin manifolds admitting parallel spinors.

Unlike the riemannian case, in a lorentzian spacetime Ricci-flatness is *not* an integrability condition for the existence of parallel spinors. Indeed suppose that ε is a nonzero parallel spinor: $\nabla_a\varepsilon = 0$. Iterating this equation we find the following integrability condition:

$$R_{ab}{}^{cd}\Gamma_{cd}\varepsilon = 0 . \quad (9)$$

Contracting with Γ^b and discarding the Γ -trilinear terms by virtue of the first Bianchi identity ($R_{[abc]}{}^d = 0$), we obtain

$$R_{ab}\Gamma^b\varepsilon = 0 . \quad (10)$$

Multiplying this equation with $R_{ac}\Gamma^c$, but not summing on a , we obtain

$$R_{ab}R_{ac}g^{bc}\varepsilon = 0 , \quad (11)$$

which implies that, for each a , the vector field with components $R_a{}^b$ is null. We will say that such a manifold is *Ricci-null*. Since in a riemannian manifold there are no null vectors, this implies that $R_{ab} = 0$, i.e., riemannian Ricci-null manifolds are Ricci-flat. In contrast, there

¹Throughout the paper, we shall adorn “flat” indices with a $\hat{}$.

are Ricci-null lorentzian manifolds which are not Ricci-flat. We will see below many examples of such manifolds. Notice that contracting equation (10) with Γ^a shows that the Ricci scalar does vanish.

In summary, in searching for supersymmetric bosonic vacua, it will not be enough to check for the existence of parallel spinors, but one must impose the equations of motion separately. This should lay to rest the widespread folklore that supersymmetric backgrounds automatically satisfy the equations of motion.

2.2. Holonomy classification of known solutions. As we have just seen, any Ricci-flat manifold admitting a parallel spinor is a supersymmetric vacuum of M-theory with zero flux, and all such vacua are of that form. The existence of parallel spinors imposes strong restrictions on the geometry and we start off by investigating which kinds of eleven-dimensional geometries admit parallel spinors. The proper tool to analyse the constraints imposed by the existence of parallel spinors is the holonomy group. In this section we will provide a preliminary holonomy analysis of the problem. As we will see, there are two types of solutions, generalising the Kaluza–Klein monopole and the *pp* wave, respectively.

The relevance of riemannian holonomy groups in studying supergravity vacua is of course well-established (see, e.g., [8]). In this paper it is however the less studied lorentzian holonomy groups which play a fundamental role. These groups are more exotic and have not been discussed much in the literature; although see [10] for some comments on the relevance of these groups in a context not unrelated to the present one.

In general, the existence of parallel tensors or spinors in a manifold imposes restrictions on the holonomy group of the manifold. In a (pseudo)riemannian spin manifold of signature $s+t$, we can express tensors and spinors relative to pseudo-orthonormal frames $\{\mathbf{e}_a\}$, and in effect set up a correspondence between these geometrical objects and representations of the Lorentz group $\mathrm{SO}(s, t)$ or more precisely of its spin cover. Let T be a tensor or spinor field transforming according to some representation ϱ of the spin group, and suppose that T is parallel with respect to the Levi-Civita connection: $\nabla_a T = 0$. The integrability condition for this equation is that the curvature satisfies

$$R_{ab}{}^{\hat{c}\hat{d}} \Lambda_{\hat{c}\hat{d}} \cdot T = 0 \quad \text{for all } a, b,$$

where $\Lambda_{\hat{c}\hat{d}}$ are the generators of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(s, t)$ in the representation ϱ under which T transforms. This means that the subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{so}(s, t)$ generated by the $R_{ab}{}^{\hat{c}\hat{d}}$ for all a, b has a singlet in the representation ϱ . The Ambrose–Singer theorem says that the Lie algebra of the holonomy group of the manifold is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{h}$; thus the existence of a parallel tensor constraints the holonomy algebra.

There is a local converse to this. The fact that the holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ has a singlet in a representation ϱ guarantees the existence of a local parallel tensor T transforming according to ϱ . If the manifold is simply-connected then all obstructions to integrating the equation $\nabla_a T = 0$ vanish, and the parallel tensor T exists globally.

With these prefatory remarks behind us, let us now investigate how the holonomy group of the spacetime is constrained by the existence of a parallel spinor. Let M be an eleven-dimensional lorentzian spin manifold admitting a parallel spinor ε . The integrability condition (9) constraints the holonomy group of the spin connection to be (conjugate to) a subgroup $H \subset \text{Spin}(10, 1)$ leaving the spinor ε invariant. Therefore we are interested in answering the following question:

Which subgroups of $\text{Spin}(10, 1)$ leave a spinor invariant?

Bryant [6] (see also [1]) has answered this question: there are two (conjugacy classes of) maximal subgroups of $\text{Spin}(10, 1)$ which leave a spinor invariant. Let ε be a spinor of $\text{Spin}(10, 1)$ and consider the vector v with components $v^a = \bar{\varepsilon} \Gamma^a \varepsilon$. Since ε is H -invariant, so is v ; whence H is contained in the subgroup of the spin group which leaves v invariant: the “little group” of v . Just as in the more familiar case of four dimensions, these subgroups can be distinguished by the type of the vector v : space-like, time-like or null (i.e., light-like). In fact, only two of the three possibilities occur. One can show that the Minkowski norm $v^2 \equiv v^a v_a$ of this vector is negative semi-definite: $v^2 \leq 0$, which means that either v is time-like, so that $v^2 < 0$, or v is null, so that $v^2 = 0$. This dichotomy gives rise to the two types of supersymmetric vacua we will study in this paper.

2.2.1. Static vacua. If v is time-like then H must be contained in the subgroup $\text{Spin}(10) \subset \text{Spin}(10, 1)$ leaving a time-like vector invariant. In fact, it is not hard to show that ε is left invariant by an $\text{SU}(5)$ subgroup of $\text{Spin}(10, 1)$. Spacetimes with holonomy groups $H \subset \text{SU}(5)$ are automatically Ricci-flat and hence satisfy the supergravity equations of motion. Such spacetimes contain a time-like Killing vector and hence are stationary. Moreover because the Killing vector is actually parallel, it is hypersurface orthogonal so that the spacetime is static. It is not hard to show that such spacetimes are locally isometric to a product $\mathbb{R} \times X$ with metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + ds^2(X) ,$$

where X is any riemannian 10-manifold with holonomy contained in $\text{SU}(5)$; that is, a Calabi–Yau 5-fold. The amount of supersymmetry which such a spacetime will preserve will depend on the number of parallel spinors. Assuming for simplicity that the manifold X is simply connected, one has a number of possibilities which are summarised in Table 1. The notation in the table is as follows. Assuming that M is

simply connected (otherwise this applies to its universal cover), it is given by a product

$$M = \mathbb{M}^{11-d} \times K_d, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbb{M}^{11-d}$ is $(11-d)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime. The table then lists the dimension d of K , the holonomy group $H \subset \text{Spin}(d)$ of K (and hence of M) and the fraction ν of the supersymmetry that such a geometry preserves. The fraction ν is related to the dimension N of the space of K -singlets in the spinor representation of $\text{Spin}(10,1)$ by $N = 32\nu$.

d	$H \subset \text{Spin}(d)$	ν
10	SU(5)	$\frac{1}{16}$
10	SU(2) $\times$ SU(3)	$\frac{1}{8}$
8	Spin(7)	$\frac{1}{16}$
8	SU(4)	$\frac{1}{8}$
8	Sp(2)	$\frac{3}{16}$
8	Sp(1) $\times$ Sp(1)	$\frac{1}{4}$
7	G_2	$\frac{1}{8}$
6	SU(3)	$\frac{1}{4}$
4	SU(2) $\cong$ Sp(1)	$\frac{1}{2}$
0	{1}	1

TABLE 1. Static M-theory vacua with $F = 0$. The geometry is of the form given by equation (12) where d , the holonomy H of K and the supersymmetry fraction ν are listed above.

The maximal supersymmetric vacuum ($\nu = 1$) corresponds to flat space, and the half-BPS states ($\nu = \frac{1}{2}$) corresponds to the Kaluza–Klein monopole and its generalisations, where the spacetime is of the form $\mathbb{M}^7 \times K$, with K a hyperkähler 4-manifold. The vacua in the table are of course interesting, but we will not consider them further in the present paper, since their classification is reduced, at least locally, to the classification of Calabi–Yau 5-folds, and we have nothing new to add to that problem here.

2.2.2. Non-static vacua. On the other hand, suppose that v is null. Following Bryant let us call such ε a *null spinor*. The isotropy subgroup (i.e., the “little group”) of a null spinor is contained in the isotropy subgroup of the null vector v , which in eleven dimensions is isomorphic to the spin cover of $\text{ISO}(9) = \text{SO}(9) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9 \subset \text{SO}(10,1)$. Indeed it is

shown in the appendix that ε is left invariant by a somewhat exotic 30-dimensional non-reductive Lie group isomorphic to

$$G = (\text{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R} \subset \text{Spin}(10, 1) , \quad (13)$$

where $\text{Spin}(7)$ acts on $\mathbb{R}^8$ according to the spinor representation. (See the appendix for the details about this group.) It is not immediately obvious that G is a possible holonomy group for an eleven-dimensional spacetime, but Bryant [6] has recently proven that this is the case and has moreover written down the most general local metric with this holonomy (see equation (27) below). In any case we will construct plenty of examples in this paper. Spacetimes with holonomy in G are not automatically Ricci-flat, but those which are will be supersymmetric vacua of M-theory. If the holonomy is precisely G , then such vacua will preserve $\frac{1}{32}$ of the supersymmetry, but one can preserve more supersymmetry by restricting the holonomy to smaller subgroups of G . In sharp contrast to the case of static vacua discussed above, restricting the holonomy will not necessarily decompose the spacetime into a metric product. In fact we will see below several new examples of half-BPS vacua with indecomposable metrics.

$H \subset \text{Spin}(10, 1)$	ν
$(\text{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$	$\frac{1}{32}$
$(\text{SU}(4) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$	$\frac{1}{16}$
$(\text{Sp}(2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$	$\frac{3}{32}$
$(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times (\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}$	$\frac{1}{8}$
$(G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7) \times \mathbb{R}^2$	$\frac{1}{16}$
$(\text{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^6) \times \mathbb{R}^3$	$\frac{1}{8}$
$(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}^5$	$\frac{1}{4}$
$\mathbb{R}^9$	$\frac{1}{2}$

TABLE 2. Indecomposable M-theory vacua with $F = 0$ in terms of their holonomy group H and the fraction ν of supersymmetry preserved.

Table 2 lists holonomy groups of simply-connected indecomposable metrics in eleven dimensions admitting parallel spinors, together with the fraction ν of the supersymmetry that such spacetimes preserve. The fraction ν is related to the dimension N of the space of H -invariant spinors by $N = 32\nu$. The holonomy groups in the table are all of the form

$$(K \ltimes \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^{9-d} ,$$

where $K \subset \text{Spin}(d)$ acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{R}^d$, except for $K = \text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1) \subset \text{Spin}(8)$ which acts reducibly on $\mathbb{R}^8$, so that one has

$$(\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1)) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8 \cong (\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times (\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) .$$

Although we believe this table to be complete, we will not attempt a proof here. The reason why this is not straight-forward to check is that the possible holonomy groups of lorentzian manifolds are not classified. The rest of this paper is devoted to a construction of metrics with the holonomy groups in this table, and in particular to those which are Ricci-flat; but before doing so we will put these results in their proper mathematical context, by discussing lorentzian holonomy groups.

2.3. Lorentzian holonomy groups. In contrast to the case of riemannian holonomy, of which a fairly complete picture has emerged in the last half of the century, the situation with lorentzian holonomy groups is very different. See [2] for a recent survey of known results. In this section we would like to explain why this is the case. This will also serve to put some of our results in their proper mathematical context.

Let M be a connected and simply-connected manifold with a pseudo-riemannian metric of signature $s+t$. The holonomy group of M is (conjugate to) a subgroup of $\text{SO}(s, t)$. A natural question is then:

Which subgroups $H \subset \text{SO}(s, t)$ can appear as holonomy groups?

Suppose that $M = M_1 \times M_2$ is isometric to a product of two pseudo-riemannian manifolds of signatures s_1+t_1 and s_2+t_2 respectively, with $s = s_1 + s_2$ and $t = t_1 + t_2$. Then the holonomy group H of M breaks up as $H = H_1 \times H_2$, where $H_1 \subset \text{SO}(s_1, t_1)$ and $H_2 \subset \text{SO}(s_2, t_2)$ are the holonomy groups of M_1 and M_2 respectively. In particular this means that the holonomy representation, by which we mean the representation of the holonomy group on the tangent vectors, is reducible.

In the riemannian case ($t = 0$) there is a converse to this result, known as the de Rham decomposition theorem [19]. This theorem states that if the holonomy representation of a simply-connected riemannian manifold is reducible, then the manifold is isometric to a product of riemannian manifolds. This allows one to restrict oneself to groups acting irreducibly, and leads after some hard work to the famous classification of riemannian holonomy groups of Cartan, Berger, Simons and others.

The first sign that things do not quite work the same way in the lorentzian ($t = 1$) case is the fact that no proper subgroup of the Lorentz group acts irreducibly on Minkowski spacetime. Luckily this does not mean that there are no interesting lorentzian holonomy groups, only that asking for irreducibility is too strong. In fact, the lorentzian analogue of the decomposition theorem, due to Wu [22], requires a weaker notion than irreducibility.

Recall that a representation of a group H on a vector space T is reducible if there is a proper subspace $U \subset T$ which is preserved by H . Suppose in addition that H preserves a non-degenerate inner product on T ; that is, H acts on T via a (pseudo)unitary representation. We say that the sub-representation $U \subset T$ is *non-degenerate* if the inner product is non-degenerate when restricted to U . In such a situation $T = U \oplus U^\perp$, where $U^\perp$ is also a sub-representation. If this the case, then we say that T is *decomposable*. Because $U \cap U^\perp$ consists of vectors with zero norm, this can only be nonzero for an indefinite inner product. In other words, a unitary representation is reducible if and only if it is decomposable. If the inner product is indefinite, so that the representation is pseudo-unitary, then there is a distinction and one can have representations which are reducible yet indecomposable. It is the stronger requirement of decomposability which is crucial for Wu's version of the decomposition theorem. Wu's theorem [22] states that if the holonomy representation is decomposable, then the manifold is isometric to a product. This fact makes the classification of lorentzian holonomy groups a much harder problem than that of the riemannian holonomy groups, since we cannot restrict ourselves to groups acting irreducibly, but must also consider those groups acting reducibly but indecomposably. In fact, the problem has not been completely solved in the classical case of four dimensions [4].

It is precisely this exotic class of holonomy groups, acting reducibly but indecomposably, which will be relevant in our construction of supersymmetric M-waves, to which we devote the rest of the paper.

3. SUPERSYMMETRIC GRAVITATIONAL pp -WAVES

In this section we discuss gravitational pp -waves, since they are the main ingredient in the construction to be presented below of metrics with holonomy given in Table 2. We will discuss the metrics of Brinkmann and of Bryant, and how to lift gravitational pp -waves to supersymmetric M-waves.

3.1. Brinkmann metrics with parallel spinors. By definition a gravitational pp -wave is a spacetime admitting a parallel null vector. As we discussed in the previous section, contrary to the riemannian case, the existence of such a vector does not necessarily split the spacetime. The most general d -dimensional lorentzian metric admitting a parallel null vector was written down by Brinkmann [5] almost 75 years ago. In a coordinate chart (x^+, x^-, x^i) , where $i = 1, \dots, d-2$, adapted to the null vector ∂_- , the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b_idx^idx^+ + g_{ij}dx^idx^j, \quad (14)$$

where $\partial_- a = \partial_- b_i = \partial_- g_{ij} = 0$. The holonomy group of such a metric is contained in

$$\text{ISO}(d-2) = \text{SO}(d-2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d-2} \subset \text{SO}(d-1, 1) ,$$

which is the isotropy group of a null vector.

We are actually interested in those metrics whose holonomy group reduces to the subgroup of (the spin cover of) $\text{ISO}(d-2)$ which preserves a spinor. We will call such a spacetime a *supersymmetric Brinkmann wave*. Since we are interested in non-static spacetimes, we will consider only those subgroups which do not leave any time-like vector invariant. Maximal such subgroups are of the form

$$K \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d-2} , \quad (15)$$

where $K \subset \text{Spin}(d-2)$ preserves a spinor. (If we were to consider those subgroups which also leave a time-like vector invariant, we would have only $K \subset \text{Spin}(d-2)$. Spacetimes with holonomy contained in K are static and hence decomposable into a metric product.) A list of possible maximal subgroups $K \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$ is given in Table 3. It is easy to obtain other subgroups, not just the maximal ones. Every group $H = K \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$ appearing in dimension d can be “lifted” to a group $H \times \mathbb{R}^i$ in dimension $d+s$, where $i = 0, 1, \dots, s$. If we insist in the holonomy group acting indecomposably then we have to choose $i = s$. This procedure gives rise to the entries in the table corresponding to $d = 7$ and $d = 11$, for example.

d	$H \subset \text{Spin}(d-1, 1)$
≤ 5	$\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$
6	$\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4$
7	$(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}$
8	$\text{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^6$
9	$G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7$
10	$\text{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8$
11	$(\text{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$

TABLE 3. Possible holonomy groups of d -dimensional supersymmetric Brinkmann waves. Only maximal subgroups are shown.

The construction described in Section 4 starts with a d -dimensional supersymmetric Brinkmann wave and warps it with a riemannian manifold of dimension $11-d$. It is therefore important to be able to write down explicit metrics with holonomy groups in the table. We will write

the most general local metric in dimension $d \leq 5$ with holonomy given by $\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$. For $d \geq 6$ it is possible to write down the most general local metric, but the expression is not completely explicit. In the case of $d = 11$ the most general such metric has been written down recently by Bryant [6]. His construction also works for $d = 10$, and indeed, after some modification, for $d = 6, 7, 8, 9$. Bryant's construction is reviewed briefly below.

3.2. Supersymmetric Brinkmann waves in $d \leq 5$. The strategy to construct the most general supersymmetric Brinkmann wave is clear: we start with the most general d -dimensional Brinkmann metric (14) and impose that the holonomy be contained in the appropriate subgroup $H \subset \text{Spin}(d-1, 1)$ in Table 3. For $d \leq 5$ this means $H = \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$, and in this case the metric can be solved explicitly in terms of a number of unknown functions of x^+ . In $d \geq 6$ this is not possible; for example, to write down the most general metric in $d = 6$, one would have to know the most general four-dimensional hyperkähler metric.

A necessary condition for the spacetime to have holonomy $\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$ is that the metric be Ricci-null, so that condition (11) is satisfied. This is not a sufficient condition, but it is often an easy condition to write down when trying to construct such a metric.

We will first of all show that the Ricci-null condition forces all components of the Ricci tensor to vanish except for R_{++} . Indeed, because ∂_- is parallel, we have that $R_{a-} = 0$ for all a , whence *a priori* the only nonzero components of the Ricci tensor are R_{ij} , R_{++} and R_{i+} , or equivalently, R_+^- , R_+^i , R_i^- and R_i^j . Now we use the Ricci-null condition: $R_{ab}R_{ac}g^{bc} = 0$ for all a . For $a = +$ this relation tells us that $R_{+i}R_{+j}g^{ij} = 0$, whence $R_{+i} = 0$. For $a = i$, we find that $R_{ij}R_{ik}g^{jk} = 0$, whence $R_{ij} = 0$. For $a = -$ the condition is vacuously satisfied. In summary, only R_{++} can be nonzero.

3.2.1. $\underline{d=2}$. The two-dimensional Brinkmann metric has the form

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(x^+)(dx^+)^2.$$

The holonomy is trivial, so that the metric is flat. In fact, if we change variables to $\tilde{x}^+ = x^+$ and $\tilde{x}^- = x^- + \frac{1}{2}f(x^+)$, where $f' = a$, then the metric is simply (dropping tildes)

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- . \tag{16}$$

3.2.2. $\underline{d=3}$. The three-dimensional Brinkmann metric has the form

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + bdx^+dx^1 + c^2(dx^1)^2 ,$$

where a, b, c are functions of x^+ and x^1 . We can simplify the metric by using local diffeomorphisms. We can change variables $x^1 \mapsto \tilde{x}^1(x^+, x^1)$ such that $\partial_1 \tilde{x}^1 = c$. Similarly we can define $\tilde{x}^- = x^- + \frac{1}{2}\phi(x^+, x^1)$,

where $\partial_1 \phi = b - 2c\partial_+ \tilde{x}^1$. Finally let $\tilde{x}^+ = x^+$. In terms of the tilded variables (but dropping the tildes) the metric becomes

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2, \quad (17)$$

where a is such that $\partial_- a = 0$, but is otherwise arbitrary.

The holonomy is correct because in three dimensions the isotropy of a null vector coincides with the isotropy of a null spinor: $\text{ISO}(1) \cong \mathbb{R} \subset \text{Spin}(2, 1)$.

The Ricci tensor can be computed in terms of the function a . From the general discussion above we know that only R_{++} will be nonzero. A simple calculation shows that $R_{++} = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_1^2 a$. As we will see in Section 4.4, we will be able to build M-theory vacua out of this Brinkmann wave provided that R_{++} is only a function of x^+ . This means that a is at most quadratic in x^1 . Such waves are known as *exact plane waves*.

3.2.3. $d=4$. The four-dimensional Brinkmann metric has the form

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b_i dx^i dx^+ + g_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (18)$$

where i, j run from 1 to 2, and a , b_i and g_{ij} are independent of x^- . We can think of g_{ij} as an x^+ -dependent family of two-dimensional riemannian metrics. Because in two dimensions every metric is conformally flat, we can assume that $g_{ij} = c^2 \delta_{ij}$, where c is independent of x^- . The metric is then

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b_i dx^i dx^+ + c^2 dx^i dx^i.$$

For generic a , b_i and c the holonomy of this metric is contained in $\text{ISO}(2) = \text{SO}(2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2 \subset \text{SO}(3, 1)$. We would like to restrict these functions so that the holonomy is precisely $\mathbb{R}^2$.

To simplify the calculations, we first impose the condition that the spacetime be Ricci-null, so that only R_{++} is different from zero. In other words, we set R_{i+} and R_{ij} equal to zero.

We will compute the Christoffel symbols Γ_{ab}^c defined by

$$\nabla_a \partial_b = \Gamma_{ab}^c \partial_c, \quad (19)$$

where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection. They can be read off from

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_+ \partial_+ &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_+ a \partial_- - \frac{1}{2} c^{-2} \partial_i a \partial_i + c^{-2} \partial_+ b_i \partial_i \\ \nabla_+ \partial_i &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_i a \partial_- + \partial_+ \log c \partial_i + \frac{1}{2} c^{-2} (\partial_i b_j - \partial_j b_i) \partial_j \\ \nabla_i \partial_j &= \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_i b_j + \partial_j b_i) \partial_- - c \partial_+ c \delta_{ij} \partial_-, \end{aligned}$$

where Γ_{ij}^k are the Christoffel symbols for the metric $c^2 \delta_{ij}$.

In our conventions, the Riemann curvature tensor is defined by

$$R_{abc}{}^d \partial_d = -[\nabla_a, \nabla_b] \partial_c, \quad (20)$$

and the Ricci curvature is given by the following contraction:

$$R_{ab} = R_{acb}{}^c. \quad (21)$$

Therefore the contribution to R_{ij} comes from

$$R_{ij} = R_{iaj}{}^a = R_{i+j}{}^+ + R_{i-j}{}^- + R_{ikj}{}^k .$$

Because ∂_- is parallel, $R_{-ab}{}^c = R_{abc}{}^+ = 0$, so that $R_{ij} = R_{ikj}{}^k$; that is, R_{ij} is the Ricci tensor of the transverse metric $c^2\delta_{ij}$. The vanishing of R_{ij} then says that the transverse metric is Ricci-flat. In two dimensions, a Ricci-flat metric is flat, so that without loss of generality we can take c to be a function only of x^+ .

We can then perform a diffeomorphism: $\tilde{x}^i = c(x^+)x^i$ to absorb the conformal factor c^2 . In the new variables, the metric becomes

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b_idx^idx^+ + dx^idx^i ,$$

where a and b_i are arbitrary functions of x^i and x^+ .

The Levi-Civita connection for this metric can be read from the one for the metric (18), by setting $c = 1$ and $\Gamma_{ij}{}^k = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_+\partial_+ &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_+a\partial_- - \frac{1}{2}\partial_ia\partial_i + \partial_+b_i\partial_i \\ \nabla_+\partial_i &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_ia\partial_- + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_ib_j - \partial_jb_i)\partial_j \\ \nabla_i\partial_j &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_ib_j + \partial_jb_i)\partial_- . \end{aligned}$$

Next we set $R_{i+} = 0$. Only $R_{ij+}{}^k$ contributes to this component of the Ricci tensor. We compute

$$-[\nabla_i, \nabla_j]\partial_+ = \frac{1}{2}\partial_k(\partial_ib_j - \partial_jb_i)\partial_k \pmod{\partial_-} ,$$

whence

$$R_{ij+}{}^k = \frac{1}{2}\partial_k(\partial_ib_j - \partial_jb_i) = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}\partial_k h ,$$

where $h = \partial_1b_2 - \partial_2b_1$. The vanishing of R_{i+} is then simply

$$\partial_k h = 0 ,$$

so that $\partial_1b_2 - \partial_2b_1$ is only a function of x^+ . The most general solution to this equation is

$$b_i = \epsilon_{ij}x^jb(x^+) + \partial_i\phi ,$$

for an arbitrary function ϕ independent of x^- .

We can reabsorb the gradient term in b_i by a local diffeomorphism $\tilde{x}^- = x^- + \frac{1}{2}\phi$. In terms of the new variables (dropping tildes) the most general four-dimensional Ricci-null Brinkmann metric becomes

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b\epsilon_{ij}x^jdx^idx^+ + dx^idx^i , \quad (22)$$

where $b = b(x^+)$ and $a = a(x^+, x^i)$ are arbitrary functions.

We claim that this metric already has the correct holonomy. Let us introduce the following pseudo-orthonormal coframe:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\hat{+}} = dx^+ , \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\hat{-}} = dx^- + \frac{1}{2}adx^+ + \frac{1}{2}b\epsilon_{ij}x^jdx^i , \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\hat{i}} = dx^i ,$$

relative to which the metric becomes

$$ds^2 = 2\theta^{\hat{+}}\theta^{\hat{-}} + \theta^{\hat{i}}\theta^{\hat{i}} .$$

The connection one-form can be computed from the first structure equation:

$$d\theta^{\hat{a}} = \theta^{\hat{b}} \wedge \omega_{\hat{b}}^{\hat{a}} . \quad (23)$$

One finds the following nonzero components:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\hat{i}}^{\hat{j}} &= b\epsilon_{ij}dx^+ , \\ \text{and } \omega_{\hat{+}}^{\hat{j}} &= -\frac{1}{2}\partial_j a dx^+ + b'\epsilon_{ji}x^i dx^+ + b\epsilon_{ij}dx^i , \end{aligned}$$

where $b' = \partial_+ b$.

The curvature two-form can be computed using the second structure equation:

$$\Omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} = d\omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} - \omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{c}} \wedge \omega_{\hat{c}}^{\hat{b}} . \quad (24)$$

One finds that the $\mathfrak{so}(2)$ component of the curvature vanishes:

$$\Omega_{\hat{i}}^{\hat{j}} = 0 .$$

Using the Ambrose–Singer theorem this says that the $\mathfrak{so}(2)$ part of the holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ vanishes, leaving $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$.

Of course, the forms for the metrics are not unique. By a change of coordinate it is possible to eliminate the mixed $dx^i dx^+$ terms at the cost of introducing some conformal factor in the transverse metric (see, for example, [20]).

Finally we record the Ricci tensor of the metric (22), whose only nonzero component is

$$R_{++} = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta a + 2b^2 ,$$

where $\Delta = \partial_i \partial_i$ is the laplacian on functions of the transverse coordinates x^i . This will be a function of x^+ alone provided that Δa has no dependence on x^i . Clearly there are plenty of such functions. We will see in Section 4 how any of these metrics can be used as an ingredient in a supersymmetric M-wave.

3.2.4. $\underline{d=5}$. The five-dimensional Brinkmann metric has the form

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b_i dx^i dx^+ + g_{ij} dx^i dx^j , \quad (25)$$

where now i, j run from 1 to 3, and a , b_i and g_{ij} are independent of x^- . We can again think of g_{ij} as an x^+ -dependent family of three-dimensional riemannian metrics. For generic choices of a , b_i and g_{ij} , the holonomy of this metric is contained in $\text{ISO}(3) = \text{SO}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^3 \subset \text{SO}(4, 1)$. We would like to choose a , b_i and g_{ij} in such a way that the holonomy is simply $\mathbb{R}^3$. This way the spacetime will admit a parallel null spinor. In particular it will be Ricci-null, so that $R_{ij} = R_{+i} = 0$. As in the

case of $d = 4$, we start by imposing the vanishing of R_{ij} , as imposing this condition from the start will simplify subsequent calculations.

The Levi-Civita connection of the above metric is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_+ \partial_+ &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_+ a \partial_- + g^{ij} (\partial_+ b_j - \frac{1}{2} \partial_j a) \partial_i \\ \nabla_+ \partial_i &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_i a \partial_- + \frac{1}{2} g^{jk} (\partial_+ g_{ik} + \partial_i b_k - \partial_k b_i) \partial_j \\ \nabla_i \partial_j &= \Gamma_{ij}{}^k \partial_k + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_i b_j + \partial_j b_i - \partial_+ g_{ij}) \partial_- ,\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_{ij}{}^k$ are the Christoffel symbols for the transverse metric g_{ij} .

The only contribution to R_{ij} again comes from the curvature tensor of the transverse space; whence setting $R_{ij} = 0$ means that the transverse metric g_{ij} must be Ricci-flat. In three dimensions, a riemannian metric is Ricci flat if and only if it is flat. This means that we can choose local coordinates so that $g_{ij} = c^2(x^+) \delta_{ij}$.

As before we can perform a local diffeomorphism: $\tilde{x}^i = c(x^+) x^i$ to absorb the conformal factor c^2 . In the new variables, the metric becomes

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + b_i dx^i dx^+ + dx^i dx^i ,$$

where a and b_i are arbitrary functions of x^i and x^+ .

Unlike the four-dimensional case, the vanishing of R_{+i} is not sufficient to restrict the holonomy. To restrict the holonomy we will compute the curvature two-form and impose the vanishing of the $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ components directly.

To this effect we introduce the pseudo-orthonormal coframe:

$$\theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^+ , \quad \theta^{\hat{-}} = dx^- + \frac{1}{2} b_i dx^i + \frac{1}{2} a dx^+ , \quad \text{and} \quad \theta^{\hat{i}} = dx^i .$$

The connection one-form can be computed from the first structure equation (23). One finds the following nonzero components:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{\hat{i}}^{\hat{j}} &= \frac{1}{4} (\partial_i b_j - \partial_j b_i) dx^+ , \\ \text{and} \quad \omega_{\hat{+}}^{\hat{j}} &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_+ b_j - \partial_j a) dx^+ - \frac{1}{4} (\partial_j b_i - \partial_i b_j) dx^i .\end{aligned}$$

The curvature two-form can be computed using the second structure equation (24). One finds that the $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ component of the curvature is given by

$$\Omega_{\hat{i}}^{\hat{j}} = -\frac{1}{4} \partial_k (\partial_i b_j - \partial_j b_i) dx^k \wedge dx^+ .$$

By the Ambrose–Singer theorem this is the $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ components of the holonomy algebra, which must vanish. As in the four-dimensional case this is equivalent to

$$\partial_k (\partial_i b_j - \partial_j b_i) = 0 ,$$

whose most general solution is

$$b_i = \epsilon_{ijk} x^j f_k(x^+) + \partial_i \phi ,$$

where the gradient term can again be reabsorbed via a local diffeomorphism $\tilde{x}^- = x^- + \frac{1}{2}\phi$.

In summary, the most general supersymmetric Brinkmann wave in five dimensions has the metric

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + \epsilon_{ijk}x^j f_k dx^i dx^+ + dx^i dx^i , \quad (26)$$

where $f_j = f_j(x^+)$ and $a = a(x^+, x^i)$ are arbitrary functions.

Finally we record the Ricci tensor corresponding to this metric (26), whose only nonzero component is

$$R_{++} = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta a - 2f^2 ,$$

where Δ is the laplacian on functions of the transverse coordinates x^i and $f^2 = f_i f_i$. As in the $d = 3, 4$ cases treated above, we see that the condition that R_{++} depend only on x^+ can be met by a large class of functions a , and for each such function we will see in the Section 4, how to construct a supersymmetric M-wave by an appropriate warping construction.

3.3. The Bryant metrics for $d = 11$ and $d = 10$. Bryant [6] has written down the most general local metric admitting parallel null spinors in $d = 11$, and his results are easily adapted to $d = 10$, and indeed to lower dimensions. The most general metric in $d = 11$ admitting a parallel null spinor is given by specialising the Brinkmann metric (14). The Bryant metric is given by

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^9)^2 + g_{ij}dx^i dx^j , \quad (27)$$

where i, j now run from 1 to 8, $\partial_- a = 0$ and now g_{ij} is an x^+ -dependent family of metrics with holonomy contained in $\text{Spin}(7)$ and obeying the property that

$$\partial_+ \Omega = \lambda \Omega + \Psi , \quad (28)$$

where Ω is the self-dual $\text{Spin}(7)$ -invariant Cayley 4-form, λ a smooth function of (x^+, x^i) and Ψ an anti-self dual 4-form. Following Bryant we call such a family of metrics *conformal anti-self dual*. This condition is locally trivial, in the sense that one can use diffeomorphisms to make sure that any one-parameter family of $\text{Spin}(7)$ holonomy metrics is conformal anti-self dual [6].

Special cases of this metric have already appeared in the literature in the context of solutions to supergravity or superstring theory. Already in [11] there is mention of unpublished work of J Richer concerning the metric

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^9 dx^i dx^i , \quad (29)$$

where a obeys $\partial_- a = 0$ but is otherwise arbitrary. This is the special case of the Bryant metric (27) where $g_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$. For generic a , this metric has holonomy $\mathbb{R}^9$.

We can gain some insight into the conformal anti-self dual condition (28) by constructing some examples. One such class of examples is the one in which the x^+ dependence of the metric is via a conformal factor, which means $\Psi = 0$ in the above expression. In other words, take

$$g_{ij}(x^+, x^i) = e^{2\sigma(x^+)} \bar{g}_{ij}(x^i) , \quad (30)$$

where $\bar{g}_{ij}$ is a fixed metric whose holonomy is contained in $\text{Spin}(7)$. (More generally we could also let σ depend on x^i , but then $\bar{g}_{ij}$ is only conformal to a metric with holonomy in $\text{Spin}(7)$.) In Section 4.3 we will construct many classes of Bryant metrics, realising the holonomy groups in Table 2 and satisfying the the conformal anti-self dual condition in a more non-trivial way than the one just described.

The Bryant metric (27) will be a supersymmetric vacuum of $d=11$ supergravity if and only if it is Ricci-flat. As explained above, this is not automatic since the existence of a parallel null spinor only implies the weaker condition (11) that the spacetime be Ricci-null. As we saw above, this forces all components of the Ricci tensor to vanish except for R_{++} . Therefore the vanishing of R_{++} becomes a differential equation for the unknown function a .

Let us write this equation down explicitly in the special case of the Bryant metric (27) satisfying equation (30).

We will therefore consider the following eleven-dimensional metric:

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^9)^2 + e^{2\sigma(x^+)} g_{ij} dx^i dx^j , \quad (31)$$

where $\partial_- a = 0$ and g_{ij} is independent of $(x^\pm, x^9)$. The nonzero Christoffel symbols can be read from equation (19) and the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_+ \partial_+ &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_+ a \partial_- - \frac{1}{2} \partial_9 a \partial_9 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\sigma} g^{ij} \partial_i a \partial_j \\ \nabla_+ \partial_9 &= \nabla_9 \partial_+ = \frac{1}{2} \partial_9 a \partial_- \\ \nabla_+ \partial_i &= \nabla_i \partial_+ = \frac{1}{2} \partial_i a \partial_- + \sigma' n \partial_i \\ \nabla_i \partial_j &= \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k - e^{2\sigma} g_{ij} \sigma' \partial_- , \end{aligned}$$

where Γ_{ij}^k are the Christoffel symbols of the metric g_{ij} , and $\sigma' = \partial_+ \sigma$.

Using the above Christoffel symbols one computes the Riemann curvature tensor (20) and finds the following nonzero components:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{+9+}{}^9 &= R_{9+9}{}^- = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_9^2 a \\ R_{+9i}{}^- &= R_{+i9}{}^- = R_{i++}{}^9 = \frac{1}{2} \partial_9 \partial_i a \\ R_{+9+}{}^i &= -\frac{1}{2} e^{-2\sigma} g^{ij} \partial_9 \partial_j a \\ R_{+i+}{}^j &= -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_i \partial^j a - (\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2) \delta_i^j \\ R_{+ij}{}^- &= \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i \partial_j a + (\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2) e^{2\sigma} g_{ij} , \end{aligned}$$

together with $R_{ijk}{}^\ell$. We now compute the Ricci curvature, defined by (21). Using the fact that $\text{Spin}(7)$ holonomy manifolds are Ricci-flat we get that $R_{ij} = 0$. Similarly, one sees that all other components vanish except for

$$R_{++} = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_9^2 a - \frac{1}{2}\nabla_i \partial^i a - 8(\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2) ,$$

as expected from the fact that ds^2 admits a parallel null spinor. Setting R_{++} to zero yields a differential equation for a :

$$\partial_9^2 a + \nabla_i \partial^i a = -16(\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2) . \quad (32)$$

Assuming the right-hand side is non-vanishing, we can simplify the equation by writing the function a in the form

$$a(x^+, x^9, x^i) = -16(\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2) b(x^9, x^i) ,$$

we see that equation (32) becomes

$$\Delta b = 1 ,$$

where Δ is the laplacian on functions of (x^9, x^i) .

Dropping all mention of x^9 , which means taking a to be independent of x^9 and performing a dimensional reduction on this coordinate, we arrive at the most general ten-dimensional metric with holonomy $\text{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8$:

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + g_{ij} dx^i dx^j , \quad (33)$$

where $a = a(x^+, x^i)$ is an arbitrary function, and g_{ij} is a conformal anti-self dual family of metrics whose holonomy is contained in $\text{Spin}(7)$.

Special cases of this metric have been studied in the literature, in the context of wave-like solutions to type IIA supergravity and superstring theories [3, 10, 9].

Similarly one can write local metrics for supersymmetric Brinkmann waves in lower dimension, provided that we choose the family of metrics $g_{ij}(x^+)$ (with $i, j = 1, \dots, d-2$) to have the appropriate holonomy and that the variation under x^+ is suitably constrained. (Compare the appendix in [10] for some examples of such spacetimes.)

4. LIFTING THE BRINKMANN WAVES

In this section we describe a construction of supersymmetric M-waves obtained by lifting d -dimensional supersymmetric Brinkmann waves to eleven dimensions. The idea is to warp the Brinkmann wave with an $(11-d)$ -dimensional riemannian manifold admitting parallel spinors. The resulting spacetime is indecomposable and admits a parallel null spinor. If the Brinkmann wave satisfies the additional requirement that R_{++} only depends on x^+ , then it will be possible to choose the warp factor so that the warped product is Ricci-flat, and hence a supersymmetric M-wave.

4.1. Warped products and Brinkmann waves. Let B_d be a d -dimensional supersymmetric Brinkmann wave. Its holonomy group $H(B) \subset \text{Spin}(d-1, 1)$ is listed in Table 3 or is built from them according to the procedure outlined above that table. Let K be an $(11-d)$ -dimensional riemannian manifold admitting parallel spinors. We will take both B and K to be simply-connected for simplicity, but clearly this does not represent any real loss of generality, at least conceptually; although in the non-simply connected case some further supersymmetry might be broken.

Let $(x^a) = (x^+, x^-, x^i)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d-2$, be local coordinates for the Brinkmann wave B , and let (y^m) for $m = 1, 2, \dots, 11-d$ be local coordinates for K . Let σ be an arbitrary function of x^+ . The warped product $M = B \times_\sigma K$ is topologically $B \times K$, but not metrically. Instead the metric on M is given by

$$ds^2 = g_{ab}(x)dx^a dx^b + e^{2\sigma} h_{mn}(y)dy^m dy^n, \quad (34)$$

where g_{ab} is the Brinkmann metric and h_{mn} is the metric on K .

Table 4 lists possible warped products of this type, according to the holonomy groups $H(B)$ and $H(K)$. Only the maximal holonomy groups are listed. For example, for $d=2, 3$ we can have a number of subgroups of $\text{Spin}(7)$ as the holonomy group of K . Some, like $\text{SU}(4)$ and $\text{Sp}(2)$ do not split K , but some like $\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1)$ do. It is not important that K be irreducible for M to be indecomposable, but it is important that B be indecomposable, at least for this construction. This constrains the subgroups which can appear as $H(B)$. (Compare with the discussion atop Table 3.)

This construction can be generalised in the following way. If the manifold K is reducible, so that it is metrically a product $K = K_1 \times \dots \times K_N$, then we can use a different warp factor σ_i in each irreducible component K_i . We shall not dwell on this generalisation, but we will see it again briefly in Section 4.3, where we will construct metrics with the holonomies in Table 2.

We claim that the metric (34) admits a parallel null spinor. Moreover we will see that when B is such that the only nonzero component R_{++} of its Ricci tensor depends only on x^+ , it will be possible to choose the warping function σ in such a way that the metric (34) is Ricci flat, and thus providing a supersymmetric M-theory vacuum. To see this we will compute the holonomy algebra of the warped product and also the Ricci tensor. We will see that the holonomy algebra always agrees with the Lie algebra of the holonomy groups in Table 2, and that all such Lie algebras appear in this way.

4.2. The holonomy group of a warped product. We start by computing the holonomy algebra of the warped product M . By the Ambrose–Singer theorem the holonomy algebra is generated by the components of the curvature two-form, so we compute this.

d	$H(B) \subset \text{Spin}(d-1, 1)$	$H(K) \subset \text{Spin}(11-d)$	$11-d$
2	$\{1\}$	$\text{Spin}(7)$	9
3	$\mathbb{R}$	$\text{Spin}(7)$	8
4	$\mathbb{R}^2$	G_2	7
5	$\mathbb{R}^3$	$\text{SU}(3)$	6
6	$\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4$	$\text{Sp}(1)$	5
7	$(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}$	$\text{Sp}(1)$	4
8	$\text{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^6$	$\{1\}$	3
9	$G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7$	$\{1\}$	2
10	$\text{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8$	$\{1\}$	1

TABLE 4. Possible supersymmetric eleven-dimensional warped products $B \times_\sigma K$. Only maximal subgroups are shown on either side.

Consider a pseudo-orthonormal coframe $\theta^{\hat{a}}$ for B and an orthonormal coframe $\theta^{\hat{m}}$ for K . We form a pseudo-orthonormal coframe $(\bar{\theta}^{\hat{A}}) = (\bar{\theta}^{\hat{a}}, \bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}})$ for M , where $\bar{\theta}^{\hat{a}} = \theta^{\hat{a}}$ and $\bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}} = e^\sigma \theta^{\hat{m}}$. In terms of this coframe the metric (34) becomes

$$ds^2 = \eta_{\hat{a}\hat{b}} \bar{\theta}^{\hat{a}} \bar{\theta}^{\hat{b}} + \delta_{\hat{m}\hat{n}} \bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}} \bar{\theta}^{\hat{n}}.$$

The connection one-form follows from the first structure equation:

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{\theta}^{\hat{a}} &= \bar{\theta}^{\hat{b}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{b}}^{\hat{a}} + \bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{a}} \\ d\bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}} &= \bar{\theta}^{\hat{n}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{n}}^{\hat{m}} + \bar{\theta}^{\hat{b}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{b}}^{\hat{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

Computing the left-hand sides of these equations and using the first structure equations in B and K separately, we find

$$\bar{\omega}_{\hat{b}}^{\hat{a}} = \omega_{\hat{b}}^{\hat{a}}, \quad \bar{\omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} = \omega_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{m}} = \partial_{\hat{a}} \sigma \bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}},$$

where $\partial_{\hat{a}} \equiv e_a^{\hat{a}} \partial_a$ are the frames dual to the coframe $\theta^{\hat{a}}$.

We compute the curvature two-form using the second structure equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} &= d\bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} - \bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{c}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{c}}^{\hat{b}} - \bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{m}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{b}} \\ \bar{\Omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{m}} &= d\bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{m}} - \bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{b}}^{\hat{m}} - \bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{n}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{n}}^{\hat{m}} \\ \bar{\Omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} &= d\bar{\omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} - \bar{\omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{a}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{n}} - \bar{\omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{p}} \wedge \bar{\omega}_{\hat{p}}^{\hat{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the explicit expressions of the connection one-forms, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} &= \Omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} \\ \bar{\Omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{m}} &= \left(\partial_{\hat{a}} \sigma \partial_{\hat{b}} \sigma \bar{\theta}^{\hat{b}} + \partial_{\hat{b}} \partial_{\hat{a}} \sigma \bar{\theta}^{\hat{b}} - \omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{b}} \partial_{\hat{b}} \sigma \right) \wedge \bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}} \\ \bar{\Omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} &= \Omega_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} - \partial_{\hat{a}} \sigma \partial^{\hat{a}} \sigma \bar{\theta}^{\hat{m}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{n}} .\end{aligned}$$

Since σ is only a function of x^+ , its gradient $\partial_{\hat{a}} \sigma$ is null: $\partial_{\hat{a}} \sigma \partial^{\hat{a}} \sigma = 0$. This sets $\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}} = \Omega_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{n}}$. We now claim that the only nonzero component of $\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{m}}$ is $\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{+}}^{\hat{m}}$. Postponing the proof of this statement momentarily, let us see what this says about the holonomy group of the warped product.

The Ambrose–Singer theorem tells us that the holonomy algebra at a point $p \in M$ is the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(10, 1)$ generated by the elements $\bar{\Omega}^{\hat{A}\hat{B}}(p)$ under linear combinations and Lie brackets. These elements are the following: $\bar{\Omega}^{\hat{a}\hat{b}}$, which span the holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{h}_B$ of the Brinkmann wave, $\bar{\Omega}^{\hat{m}\hat{n}}$ which span the holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{h}_K$ of the transverse space K , and $\bar{\Omega}^{\hat{+}\hat{m}}$ which span an abelian algebra isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{11-d}$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_B$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{k} \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$, where $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{so}(d-2)$ preserves some spinors and acts on $\mathbb{R}^{d-2}$ by restricting the vector representation of $\mathfrak{so}(d-2)$ to $\mathfrak{k}$. The holonomy algebra $\mathfrak{h}_M$ is then isomorphic to $(\mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{h}_K) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9$.

Going through the Lie algebras of the holonomy groups in Table 4 we see that the holonomy algebra of $M = B \times_{\sigma} K$ is given by the Lie algebra of the following groups, indexed according to the dimension d of the Brinkmann wave:

- for $d = 2, 3, 10, 11$,

$$\mathrm{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9 \cong (\mathrm{Spin}(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R} ;$$

- for $d = 4, 9$,

$$G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9 \cong (G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7) \times \mathbb{R}^2 ;$$

- for $d = 5, 8$,

$$\mathrm{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9 \cong (\mathrm{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^6) \times \mathbb{R}^3 ;$$

- and for $d = 6, 7$,

$$(\mathrm{Sp}(1) \times \mathrm{Sp}(1)) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9 \cong (\mathrm{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times (\mathrm{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R} .$$

These holonomy groups appear in Table 2. The other groups in that table can be obtained via the same construction, but where we take spaces B and K which do not realise the maximal allowed holonomy group, but a subgroup. In Section 4.3 below we will see how to obtain all the holonomy groups in Table 2 by warping a three-dimensional Brinkmann wave with holonomy $\mathbb{R}$ together with an eight-dimensional space K of holonomy $H(K) \subseteq \mathrm{Spin}(7)$ to obtain a space with holonomy $H(K) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^9$.

Now we return to the proof of the statement that the only mixed component of the curvature two-form is $\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{+}}^{\hat{m}} = -\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{m}}^{\hat{+}}$. This will follow from the explicit expression for $\bar{\Omega}_{\hat{+}}^{\hat{m}}$ given above, and the following two observations: that the only nonzero component of the gradient $\partial_{\hat{a}}\sigma$ is $\partial_{\hat{+}}\sigma$, and that $\omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{+}} = 0$.

To prove these assertions we must go back to the metric (14) for a Brinkmann wave. A convenient pseudo-orthonormal coframe $(\theta^{\hat{a}})$ is given by $(\theta^{\hat{+}}, \theta^{\hat{-}}, \theta^{\hat{i}})$, where $\theta^{\hat{i}}$ is an orthonormal coframe for g_{ij} , $\theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^+$ and

$$\theta^{\hat{-}} = dx^- + \frac{1}{2}adx^+ + \frac{1}{2}b_id x^i .$$

From this expression it is plain to see that dual pseudo-orthonormal frame $\partial_{\hat{a}} = e_{\hat{a}}^a \partial_a$ is such that the only nonzero component of $e_{\hat{a}}^+$ is $e_{\hat{+}}^+ = 1$. Since the warp factor σ is only a function of x^+ , it follows that $\partial_{\hat{a}}\sigma$ vanishes except for $\partial_{\hat{+}}\sigma = \partial_+\sigma$. This proves the first assertion.

To prove the second assertion we consider the first structure equation (23) relating the coframe with the connection one-forms. Because dx^- does not appear in $d\theta^{\hat{a}}$ for any a and dx^- only appears in $\theta^{\hat{-}}$ it follows that $\theta^{\hat{-}}$ must not appear in the right-hand side of the structure equation (23). In other words, $\omega_{\hat{-}}^{\hat{a}} = 0$ for all a . But because the coframe is pseudo-orthonormal, one has that $\omega_{\hat{a}}^{\hat{+}} = -\eta_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\omega_{\hat{-}}^{\hat{b}} = 0$.

4.3. Some metrics with holonomy in Table 2. In this section we will show how to construct indecomposable eleven-dimensional spacetimes with each of the holonomy groups in Table 2. The resulting spacetime will be a (generalised) warped product M of a three-dimensional supersymmetric Brinkmann wave B and an eight-dimensional manifold K with holonomy contained in $\text{Spin}(7)$. This guarantees that K and, hence, M admit a parallel spinor. Equation (17) describes the most general local metric for a three-dimensional supersymmetric Brinkmann wave. It depends on one arbitrary function a of x^+ and x^1 . Since the eight-dimensional space K need not be irreducible, we have many possible choices. We will now discuss each choice very briefly, and for each choice we will write down a metric with holonomy group in Table 2 depending on at least two functions: the function a in the metric for B and one warping function for each irreducible component of K .

4.3.1. $(\text{Spin}(7) \times \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$. We take K to be irreducible with holonomy $\text{Spin}(7)$, and let the metric be given by

$$ds^2(K) = g_{mn}(y)dy^m dy^n . \quad (35)$$

Let σ be an arbitrary function of x^+ and consider the metric given by

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2 + e^{2\sigma} g_{mn} dy^m dy^n . \quad (36)$$

For generic a and σ the holonomy of this metric is the maximal subgroup G given in equation (13). From the appendix it follows that there is precisely one parallel spinor. If the manifold is Ricci-flat (see below) then it is an **M**-wave preserving precisely $\frac{1}{32}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.2. $(\text{SU}(4) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$. Let K be irreducible with metric given by equation (35) but with holonomy $\text{SU}(4)$. Then the warped product metric given by the expression (36) now has holonomy

$$(\text{SU}(4) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$$

and, by the results of the appendix, preserves exactly $\frac{1}{16}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.3. $(\text{Sp}(2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$. Let K again be irreducible with metric given by equation (35) but with holonomy $\text{Sp}(2)$. Then the warped product metric given by the expression (36) now has holonomy

$$(\text{Sp}(2) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}$$

and, by the results of the appendix, preserves exactly $\frac{3}{32}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.4. $(G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7) \times \mathbb{R}^2$. Let K have holonomy G_2 . This means that it is reducible. The metric is given locally by

$$ds^2(K) = g_{mn}(y)dy^m dy^n + (dy^8)^2 ,$$

where m, n now only run from 1 to 7 and $g_{mn}(y)$, which is independent of y^8 , has holonomy G_2 . Let σ and σ_8 be arbitrary functions of x^+ , and consider the following generalised warped product:

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2 + e^{2\sigma} g_{mn} dy^m dy^n + e^{2\sigma_8} (dy^8)^2 .$$

A similar calculation to the one in Section 4.2, which discusses the degenerate case $\sigma_8 = \sigma$, shows that the holonomy group of the above metric is

$$(G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7) \times \mathbb{R}^2 ,$$

which, by the results of the appendix, preserves $\frac{1}{16}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.5. $(\text{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^6) \times \mathbb{R}^3$. Let K now have holonomy $\text{SU}(3)$, so that it is again reducible. The metric is given locally by

$$ds^2(K) = g_{mn}(y)dy^m dy^n + (dy^7)^2 + (dy^8)^2 ,$$

where m, n now only run from 1 to 6 and $g_{mn}(y)$, which is independent of y^7 and y^8 , has holonomy $\text{SU}(3)$. Let σ , σ_7 and σ_8 be arbitrary functions of x^+ , and consider the following generalised warped product:

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2 + e^{2\sigma} g_{mn} dy^m dy^n + \sum_{i=7}^8 e^{2\sigma_i} (dy^i)^2 .$$

A similar calculation to the one in Section 4.2, which again discusses the degenerate case $\sigma_7 = \sigma_8 = \sigma$, shows that the holonomy group of the above metric is

$$(\text{SU}(3) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^6) \times \mathbb{R}^3 ,$$

which, by the results of the appendix, preserves $\frac{1}{8}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.6. $(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times (\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}$. Let K now be reducible with holonomy $\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1)$. It has two irreducible components, each having holonomy $\text{Sp}(1)$. The metric is given locally by

$$ds^2(K) = g_{mn}^{(1)} dy^m dy^n + g_{\bar{m}\bar{n}}^{(2)} dy^{\bar{m}} dy^{\bar{n}} ,$$

where m, n now only run from 1 to 4 and $\bar{m}, \bar{n}$ run from 5 to 8. As before $g_{mn}^{(1)}$, which is independent of $y^5, \dots, y^8$, and $g_{\bar{m}\bar{n}}^{(2)}$, which is independent of $y^1, \dots, y^4$, have separately holonomy $\text{Sp}(1)$. Let σ_1 and σ_2 be arbitrary functions of x^+ , and consider the following generalised warped product:

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2 + e^{2\sigma_1} g_{mn}^{(1)} dy^m dy^n + e^{2\sigma_2} g_{\bar{m}\bar{n}}^{(2)} dy^{\bar{m}} dy^{\bar{n}} .$$

The similar calculation as in Section 4.2, which again discusses the degenerate case $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$, shows that the holonomy group of the above metric is

$$(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times (\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R} ,$$

which, by the results of the appendix, preserves $\frac{1}{8}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.7. $(\text{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}^5$. Let K have holonomy $\text{Sp}(1)$. This is a specialisation of the previous case where $g^{(2)}$ is now the flat metric. Therefore the metric is given locally by

$$ds^2(K) = g_{mn}(y) dy^m dy^n + dy^{\bar{n}} dy^{\bar{n}} ,$$

where m, n now only run from 1 to 4 and $\bar{m}, \bar{n}$ run from 5 to 8, and where g_{mn} is independent on $y^5, \dots, y^8$. Let $\sigma, \sigma_5, \dots, \sigma_8$ be arbitrary

functions of x^+ , and consider the following generalised warped product:

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2 + e^{2\sigma} g_{mn} dy^m dy^n + \sum_{\bar{n}} e^{2\sigma_{\bar{n}}} dy^{\bar{n}} dy^{\bar{n}} .$$

Again as in Section 4.2, which discusses the degenerate case where all the warping factors are equal, one sees that the holonomy group of the above metric is

$$(\mathrm{Sp}(1) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^4) \times \mathbb{R}^5 ,$$

which, by the results of the appendix, preserves $\frac{1}{4}$ of the supersymmetry.

4.3.8. $\mathbb{R}^9$. Finally we take K to be flat. Let σ_m for $m = 1, \dots, 8$ be arbitrary functions of x^+ . The generalised warped product with metric

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- + a(dx^+)^2 + (dx^1)^2 + e^{2\sigma_m} dy^m dy^m$$

has holonomy $\mathbb{R}^9$ for generic σ_m . As shown in the appendix it therefore preserves $\frac{1}{2}$ of the supersymmetry. When $\sigma_m = 0$ for all m , we obtain the metric (29).

All the local metrics given in this section are special cases of the Bryant metric (27) where the family of eight-dimensional metrics is such that equation (28) is satisfied.

4.4. Ricci-flatness: building the M-wave. All the spacetimes resulting from the warping construction just described admit a parallel null spinor. This means that provided they solve the supergravity equations of motion, they are supersymmetric M-theory vacua. Because they admit a parallel spinor, they are Ricci-null. As explained above, their Ricci tensor has only one nonzero component R_{++} . Now we investigate whether it is possible to choose the warp factor σ in such a way that the resulting warped product is Ricci-flat. We will see that provided that R_{++} depends only on x^+ , we will be able to choose σ appropriately. Whereas not every supersymmetric Brinkmann wave has this property, we saw in the Section 3.2 that many do and in the next section we will see one such example in detail.

Let us compute the Ricci tensor of the warped product M . Let $\bar{\nabla}$ denote the Levi-Civita connection of the warped product $M = B \times_{\sigma} K$, and ∇ the Levi-Civita connection of each of the component spaces B and K . The Christoffel symbols can be read using (19) from the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\nabla}_a \partial_b &= \nabla_a \partial_b \\ \bar{\nabla}_a \partial_m &= \bar{\nabla}_m \partial_a = \partial_a \sigma \partial_m \\ \bar{\nabla}_m \partial_n &= \nabla_m \partial_n - g^{ab} \partial_b \sigma e^{2\sigma} h_{mn} \partial_a . \end{aligned}$$

The curvature tensor of M , similarly adorned with a bar to distinguish it from that of B and K , has the following nonzero components:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}_{abc}{}^d &= R_{abc}{}^d \\ \bar{R}_{amb}{}^n &= -(\nabla_a \partial_b \sigma + \partial_a \sigma \partial_b \sigma) \delta_m{}^n \\ \bar{R}_{amn}{}^b &= h_{mn} \nabla_a (e^{2\sigma} \partial^b \sigma) \\ \bar{R}_{mnp}{}^q &= R_{mnp}{}^q + e^{2\sigma} g^{ab} \partial_a \sigma \partial_b \sigma (h_{np} \delta_m{}^q - h_{mp} \delta_n{}^q) .\end{aligned}$$

The holonomy of the warped product implies that M is Ricci-null, and this implies that $\bar{R}_{++}$ is the only nonzero component in the Ricci tensor. But we can verify this directly. The Ricci curvature is given by contracting the Riemann curvature:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}_{ab} &= R_{ab} - (11 - d) (\nabla_a \partial_b \sigma + \partial_a \sigma \partial_b \sigma) \\ \bar{R}_{an} &= 0 \\ \bar{R}_{mn} &= R_{mn} + h_{mn} \nabla_a (e^{2\sigma} \partial^a \sigma) - (10 - d) h_{mn} e^{2\sigma} g^{ab} \partial_a \sigma \partial_b \sigma .\end{aligned}$$

We expand

$$\nabla_a (e^{2\sigma} \partial^a \sigma) = e^{2\sigma} (2\partial_a \sigma \partial^a \sigma + \partial_a \partial^a \sigma + \Gamma_{ab}{}^a \partial^b \sigma) .$$

Indeed, because σ only depends on x^+ , it is harmonic

$$\partial_a \partial^a \sigma = 0 ,$$

and its gradient is null

$$\partial_a \sigma \partial^a \sigma = 0 .$$

Similarly the only component of the gradient is $\partial^- \sigma$, which together with the fact that $\Gamma_{a-}{}^b = 0$ (which follows from the fact that ∂_- is parallel) shows that

$$\Gamma_{ab}{}^a \partial^b \sigma = 0 .$$

Because K is riemannian and admits parallel spinors, it is Ricci-flat, whence $R_{mn} = 0$. Putting all this together we see that $\bar{R}_{mn} = 0$. Now because B is a supersymmetric Brinkmann wave, only R_{++} is nonzero. Finally, using again that σ only depends on x^+ , we see that the only nonzero component of

$$\nabla_a \partial_b \sigma + \partial_a \sigma \partial_b \sigma$$

is the $_{++}$ component, which is equal to

$$\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2 ,$$

where $\sigma' = \partial_+ \sigma$. In summary, the only nonzero component of the Ricci tensor of M is given by

$$\bar{R}_{++} = R_{++} - (11 - d) (\sigma'' + (\sigma')^2) .$$

In terms of $f = e^\sigma$, the vanishing of $\bar{R}_{++}$ becomes the *linear* equation:

$$f'' = \frac{1}{11-d} R_{++} f , \quad (37)$$

which can be solved for f (and hence σ) provided that R_{++} depends *only on* x^+ . As was mentioned earlier, this is not always the case for every supersymmetric Brinkmann wave, but as we saw in Section 3.2 there are plenty of examples for which this is the case. In particular, for $d = 4$ many examples are known (see, e.g., [14] and references therein). A more recent four-dimensional example is discussed in the next section.

5. AN EXPLICIT EXAMPLE: THE NAPPI–WITTEN WAVE

The Nappi–Witten background, with the parallelising torsion coming from the group structure, is a supersymmetric background for ten-dimensional type II supergravity² and indeed of type II superstring theory [18]. On the other hand, in this section, we will show how to lift the Nappi–Witten metric to eleven dimensions and construct from it a supersymmetric vacuum of $d=11$ supergravity.

5.1. The Nappi–Witten geometry. We start by discussing the geometry of the Nappi–Witten metric, paying close attention to its holonomy.

The Nappi–Witten spacetime [18] describes a four-dimensional solvable Lie group N possessing a bi-invariant lorentzian metric. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}$ is the universal central extension of the two-dimensional euclidean algebra, with generators $\{X_1, X_2, X_-, X_+\}$ obeying the following non-vanishing Lie brackets:

$$[X_i, X_j] = \epsilon_{ij} X_- \quad \text{and} \quad [X_+, X_i] = \epsilon_{ij} X_j , \quad (38)$$

where $i, j = 1, 2$ and $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$. Up to scale, there is a one-parameter family of invariant scalar products:

$$\langle X_i, X_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} , \quad \langle X_+, X_+ \rangle = b \quad \text{and} \quad \langle X_+, X_- \rangle = 1 . \quad (39)$$

Clearly these metrics are non-degenerate, ad-invariant, and lorentzian.

The parameter b is inessential. Changing basis to $\{X'_1, X'_2, X'_+, X'_-\}$ where $X'_i = X_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, $X'_- = X_-$ and $X'_+ = X_+ - \frac{1}{2}bX_-$, the metric now has $b = 0$. Since X_- is central and $X_+ \notin [\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{n}]$, this change of basis is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{n}$. Therefore without loss of generality we will set $b = 0$ and drop the primes in the generators.

A convenient coordinate chart for N is given by

$$n(x) = e^{x^1 X_1 + x^2 X_2} e^{x^- X_- + x^+ X_+} \in N , \quad (40)$$

²Strictly speaking, the vacuum is $N \times K$ with K a suitable six-dimensional manifold, e.g., T^6 , a Calabi–Yau 3-fold,...

where the coordinates (x^1, x^2, x^-, x^+) take values in $\mathbb{R}^4$. Strictly speaking, this is the universal cover of the Nappi–Witten spacetime. It is possible to consider quotients where the coordinate x^+ is periodic, but we will not do so here, since periodicity would spoil the construction in Section 5.2 of a supersymmetric background for $d=11$ supergravity. We will comment on this again later on.

The left- and right-invariant Maurer–Cartan forms are given by

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_L = n(x)^{-1} dn(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_R = dn(x) n(x)^{-1} . \quad (41)$$

These are one-forms on N taking values in $\mathfrak{n}$. We can define a left-invariant metric ds^2 in N by

$$ds^2 = \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_L, \boldsymbol{\theta}_L \rangle \equiv \boldsymbol{\theta}_L^i \boldsymbol{\theta}_L^i + 2\boldsymbol{\theta}_L^+ \boldsymbol{\theta}_L^- , \quad (42)$$

with summation over $i = 1, 2$ implied. Because the scalar product (39) is ad-invariant, we can also write ds^2 in terms of the right-invariant Maurer–Cartan forms as

$$ds^2 = \langle \boldsymbol{\theta}_R, \boldsymbol{\theta}_R \rangle ,$$

which shows that ds^2 is also right-invariant.

In terms of the local coordinate chart (40), the metric (42) becomes

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+ dx^- + \epsilon_{ij} x^j dx^i dx^+ + dx^i dx^i , \quad (43)$$

which is of the form (22) with $a = 0$ and $b = 1$. Hence from our previous analysis we know that this is a supersymmetric Brinkmann wave. Nevertheless let us compute some of the geometrical objects associated with this metric.

The non-vanishing coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection are

$$\nabla_+ \partial_i = \nabla_i \partial_+ = -\frac{1}{4} x^i \partial_- - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \partial_j , \quad (44)$$

where $i, j = 1, 2$. The nonzero components of the Riemann curvature tensor are given by

$$R_{+i+}{}^j = \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{+i+}{}^- = -\frac{1}{8} \epsilon_{ij} x^j , \quad (45)$$

from where we compute the Ricci tensor, whose only nonzero component is

$$R_{++} = \frac{1}{2} . \quad (46)$$

Hence the Nappi–Witten geometry is *not* Ricci-flat, although the curvature scalar does vanish.

In order to construct the spin connection, we first need to choose a pseudo-orthonormal coframe. It will prove convenient to use yet a third coframe $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, different from the either of the two Maurer–Cartan coframes. Let us define

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\hat{i}} = dx^i + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} x^j dx^+ , \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\hat{-}} = dx^- - \frac{1}{8} |x|^2 dx^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\hat{+}} = dx^+ , \quad (47)$$

where $|x|^2 \equiv x^i x^i$. In terms of this coframe, the metric (43) is simply

$$ds^2 = \theta^{\hat{i}} \theta^{\hat{i}} + 2\theta^{\hat{+}} \theta^{\hat{-}} . \quad (48)$$

The connection one-form ω is defined by the first structure equation (23). Defining $\omega^{\hat{a}\hat{b}} = -\eta^{\hat{b}\hat{c}} \omega_{\hat{c}}^{\hat{a}}$, we can express the nonzero components of the connection one-form as follows:

$$\omega_+^{\hat{1}\hat{2}} = -\frac{1}{2} , \quad \omega_+^{\hat{1}\hat{-}} = -\frac{1}{4} x^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_+^{\hat{2}\hat{-}} = -\frac{1}{4} x^2 . \quad (49)$$

The curvature two-form Ω follows from the second structure equation (24). It follows from equation (49) that the quadratic term does not contribute, from where we see that the only nonzero components of the curvature two-form are

$$\Omega_{1+}^{\hat{1}\hat{-}} = -\frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_{2+}^{\hat{2}\hat{-}} = -\frac{1}{4} , \quad (50)$$

which can be shown to agree with (45).

By the Ambrose–Singer theorem, the holonomy algebra is the Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{so}(3,1)$ spanned by the $\frac{1}{2}\Omega_{ab}^{\hat{c}\hat{d}} e_{\hat{c}} \wedge e_{\hat{d}}$ for all a, b , where we are identifying the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}_{3,1}$ of the Lorentz group with the bivectors $\bigwedge^2 \mathbb{M}^4$ in Minkowski spacetime. In the case at hand the holonomy algebra is the two-dimensional abelian subalgebra generated by $h_i \equiv e_{\hat{i}} \wedge e_{\hat{-}}$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $\{e_{\hat{a}}\}$ is a pseudo-orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{M}^4$ with inner product $\langle e_{\hat{a}}, e_{\hat{b}} \rangle = \eta_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}$, then the infinitesimal Lorentz transformations are given by:

$$[e_{\hat{a}} \wedge e_{\hat{b}}, e_{\hat{c}}] = \eta_{\hat{a}\hat{c}} e_{\hat{b}} - \eta_{\hat{b}\hat{c}} e_{\hat{a}} . \quad (51)$$

Notice that the action of the holonomy representation in $\mathbb{M}^4$ is reducible, yet it is indecomposable. To see this let us consider the action of the h_i on the basis $\{e_{\hat{a}}\}$ of $\mathbb{M}^4$. It acts via null rotations:

$$\begin{aligned} [h_1, e_{\hat{1}}] &= e_{\hat{-}} & [h_1, e_{\hat{2}}] &= 0 & [h_1, e_{\hat{+}}] &= -e_{\hat{1}} & [h_1, e_{\hat{-}}] &= 0 \\ [h_2, e_{\hat{1}}] &= 0 & [h_2, e_{\hat{2}}] &= e_{\hat{-}} & [h_2, e_{\hat{+}}] &= -e_{\hat{2}} & [h_2, e_{\hat{-}}] &= 0 . \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the line spanned by $e_{\hat{-}}$ is a subrepresentation which does not split. The $\mathfrak{h}$ -invariant forms are given in Table 5. By the holonomy principle these invariants give rise to parallel forms in the Nappi–Witten spacetime.

Rank	Parallel Forms
0	1
1	$\theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^+$
2	$\theta^{\hat{i}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^i \wedge dx^+$
3	$\theta^{\hat{1}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{2}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^+$
4	$\theta^{\hat{1}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{2}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{-}} \wedge \theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^- \wedge dx^+$

TABLE 5. Parallel forms in the Nappi–Witten spacetime

The Nappi–Witten spacetime N is parallelisable (it is a Lie group) and hence it admits a spin structure; although, as the curvature calculation shows, the parallelising connection is not the Levi-Civita connection. Nevertheless, as we will see presently, the Nappi–Witten manifold admits parallel spinors.

We can first of all detect the existence of parallel spinors by studying the action of the holonomy algebra on the spinors. The spinors are in a representation of $\text{Spin}(3, 1) \cong \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, which sits inside the Clifford algebra $\text{Cl}(3, 1)$. Let $\varrho : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \text{Cl}(3, 1)$ denote the spinorial representation of the holonomy algebra, defined by

$$\varrho(h_i) = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i\Gamma_{\hat{+}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2,$$

where the $\{\Gamma_{\hat{a}}\} = \{\Gamma_i, \Gamma_{\hat{+}}, \Gamma_{\hat{+}}\}$ satisfy

$$\{\Gamma_{\hat{a}}, \Gamma_{\hat{b}}\} = -2\eta_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\mathbb{1}. \quad (52)$$

By the holonomy principle, parallel spinors will be in one-to-one correspondence with $\mathfrak{h}$ -invariant spinors. A spinor ε is $\mathfrak{h}$ -invariant if and only if

$$(\forall i) \quad \Gamma_i\Gamma_{\hat{+}}\varepsilon = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \Gamma_{\hat{+}}\varepsilon = 0.$$

Since $\Gamma_{\hat{+}}^2 = 0$ and $\{\Gamma_{\hat{+}}, \Gamma_{\hat{+}}\} = -2\mathbb{1}$, it follows that

$$\Gamma_{\hat{+}}\varepsilon = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \varepsilon = \Gamma_{\hat{+}}\chi,$$

where $\chi = -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\hat{+}}\varepsilon$. In other words, one half of the spinors are parallel.

We can solve explicitly for the parallel spinors as follows. Let ε be a parallel spinor. It satisfies the differential equation

$$\partial_a \varepsilon = -\frac{1}{4}\omega_a^{\hat{c}\hat{d}}\Gamma_{\hat{c}\hat{d}}\varepsilon.$$

From the explicit expression of the spin connection (49), this equation becomes

$$\partial_i \varepsilon = \partial_{\hat{+}} \varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\hat{+}} \varepsilon = \frac{1}{4}\Gamma_{\hat{1}\hat{2}}\varepsilon,$$

where we have used that $\Gamma_{\hat{+}}\varepsilon = 0$. Since $\Gamma_{\hat{1}\hat{2}}^2 = -\mathbb{1}$, it is a complex structure. Since it commutes with $\Gamma_{\hat{+}}$ it preserves those spinors in its kernel and can be diagonalised there. Therefore let us write $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_+ + \varepsilon_-$, where $\Gamma_{\hat{1}\hat{2}}\varepsilon_{\pm} = \pm i\varepsilon_{\pm}$, and $\Gamma_{\hat{+}}\varepsilon_{\pm} = 0$. Then

$$\partial_{\hat{+}} \varepsilon_{\pm} = \pm \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon_{\pm},$$

which has solutions

$$\varepsilon = \chi_+ e^{ix^+/4} + \chi_- e^{-ix^+/4},$$

where $\chi_{\pm}$ are constant spinors satisfying $\Gamma_{\hat{+}}\chi_{\pm} = 0$ and $\Gamma_{\hat{1}\hat{2}}\chi_{\pm} = \pm i\chi_{\pm}$. We can further impose a reality condition on ε by taking $\chi_+ = \chi_-^*$. Notice that since spinors can change by a sign around a non-contractible loop, it would be possible to periodically identify $x^+ \sim x^+ + 4\pi N$, for some integer N , and still have parallel spinors.

5.2. Lifting the Nappi–Witten background. We now discuss how to lift the Nappi–Witten background to eleven dimensions while preserving supersymmetry.

Let K be a seven-dimensional riemannian manifold with holonomy group contained in $G_2 \subset \mathrm{SO}(7)$. Let σ be an arbitrary function of x^+ and let us consider the warped product $M = N \times_\sigma K$ with metric

$$ds^2 = ds^2(N) + e^{2\sigma} ds^2(K) . \quad (53)$$

From the results in Section 4 we know that the above warped product has holonomy contained in $(G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and therefore it admits a parallel null spinor. The spacetime will in addition be Ricci-flat provided that the function $f = e^\sigma$ obeys the differential equation (37), which using equation (46) becomes

$$f'' = \frac{1}{14}f = 0 .$$

Notice that the solutions to this equation grow asymptotically for $|x^+| \rightarrow \infty$, and hence we are not allowed to periodically identify x^+ , and are forced instead to work on the universal cover of the Nappi–Witten spacetime.

If the metric on K has holonomy precisely G_2 then M admits a total of 2 parallel spinors and this means that the spacetime preserves $\frac{1}{16}$ of the supersymmetry. At the other extreme, if K is flat, then the holonomy group of M is $\mathbb{R}^9$ and it admits a total of 16 parallel spinors, accounting for $\frac{1}{2}$ of the supersymmetry. By choosing the holonomy group of K to be any admissible group in between: $\mathrm{SU}(3)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(1) = \mathrm{SU}(2)$, we can obtain $\frac{1}{8}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$ the supersymmetry, respectively. In other words, the spacetime preserves $\frac{1}{2}$ of the supersymmetry preserved by the vacuum $\mathbb{M}^4 \times K$.

6. SOME SOLUTIONS WITH $F \neq 0$

In this section we will investigate the possibility of relaxing the assumption of vanishing four-form while preserving the form of the metric. As we have seen above, the metrics we constructed depend on some arbitrary functions which are then further constrained to make the spacetime Ricci-flat, as demanded by the equations of motion. With a nonzero four-form, the equations of motion will change: in particular the metric will not be Ricci-flat; but this just changes the conditions on the arbitrary functions the metric depends on. Therefore it seems *a priori* that there might be room for introducing a non-zero F while preserving the form of the metric.

Indeed, as we will now see, it will be possible in some cases to add a nonzero four-form while both preserving supersymmetry and satisfying the Maxwell and Einstein equations of motion. Our approach derives its inspiration from the work of Hull [11], who took the metric given by equation (29) and showed how to add nonzero gravitino and four-form

to obtain a supersymmetric vacuum of eleven-dimensional supergravity. In fact, Hull's solution can be specialised by setting the gravitino to zero and hence one obtains in this way a supersymmetric bosonic vacuum with nonzero four-form.

The metric (29) is rather special, since it has holonomy $\mathbb{R}^9$. In this section we will investigate whether it is possible to make supersymmetric vacua with nonzero F and with metrics of larger holonomy. We will see that this will be possible for metrics with all the holonomy groups in Table 2 *except* for those with the largest possible holonomy G in (13).

6.1. Supersymmetric bosonic vacua with nonzero flux. We now go about adding F to the background defined by Bryant's metric (27), in such a way that the equations of motion are satisfied. We first need to write down a suitable F . Because the Bryant metric admits a parallel null spinor it is Ricci-null, and because ∂_- is parallel, this means that the only nonzero component of the Ricci tensor is R_{++} . This implies that the scalar curvature R vanishes and if the equations of motion (5) are to be satisfied, then the only nonzero component of the energy-momentum tensor is T_{++} . This means that the four-form F is null; in fact, F must be of the form

$$F = dx^+ \wedge \Phi , \quad (54)$$

where Φ is a 3-form with components $\Phi_{\mu\nu\rho}$ where μ, ν, ρ take the values 1 to 9; in other words, $\partial_- \lrcorner \Phi = 0$. We now impose the Bianchi identity and the equation of motion for F .

The Bianchi identity ($dF = 0$) is satisfied provided that Φ is closed as a 3-form in the 9-dimensional space X_9 parametrised by x^μ for $\mu = 1, \dots, 9$, and that it is independent of x^- . The dependence on x^+ is not constrained.

The equation of motion (4) simply says that F is co-closed: $d\star F = 0$. The Hodge dual of F relative to the Bryant metric is given by

$$\star F = \frac{1}{2} dx^+ \wedge \star_9 \Phi ,$$

where $\star_9$ is the Hodge dual in X_9 relative to the x^+ -dependent metric

$$ds^2(X_9) = (dx^9)^2 + g_{ij} dx^i dx^j . \quad (55)$$

Therefore the equations of motion simply says that $\star_9 \Phi = 0$ is a closed form on X_9 . In other words, Φ is an x^+ -dependent family of harmonic forms on X_9 (relative to the x^+ -dependent family of metrics (55)). In order to constraint Φ further it will be necessary to impose that the background be supersymmetric.

The condition for a bosonic background to be supersymmetric is the vanishing of the supersymmetry variation of the gravitino, which is given by equation (7), with $\theta_a(F)$ given by (8). In order to find

solutions to this equation we will make the following *assumption*: that the spinors ε satisfy

$$\Gamma_{\perp}\varepsilon = 0 . \quad (56)$$

It might be possible to prove that this assumption is actually forced upon us, by a full analysis of the integrability of equation (7), but thus far we have been unable to prove it. At any rate, together with the form (54) for F , this assumption implies that $\theta_a \cdot \varepsilon = 0$ for all a except $a = +$, for which

$$\theta_+(F) \cdot \varepsilon = -\frac{1}{6}\Phi \cdot \varepsilon , \quad (57)$$

where $\Phi \cdot \varepsilon = \frac{1}{6}\Phi_{\mu\nu\rho}\Gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\varepsilon$. Equation (7) now becomes

$$\nabla_{-}\varepsilon = 0 , \quad \nabla_{\mu}\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_{+}\varepsilon = -\frac{1}{6}\Phi \cdot \varepsilon . \quad (58)$$

The integrability of these equations implies that Φ is a parallel form (compare with [12]). In other words, the metric (55) on X_9 should admit a parallel 3-form.

Let us now show that the third equation in (58) is actually just

$$\partial_{+}\varepsilon = -\frac{1}{6}\Phi \cdot \varepsilon , \quad (59)$$

which basically fixes the dependence of ε on x^{+} . To prove this, all we need to show is that $\omega_{+}^{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\Gamma_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\varepsilon = 0$. This follows from the condition that $\Gamma_{\perp}\varepsilon = 0$ and the fact that the variation of the metric is conformal anti-self dual.

To see this let us write down the spin connection for the Bryant metric (27). Consider the following pseudo-orthonormal coframe:

$$\theta^{\hat{+}} = dx^{+} \quad \theta^{\hat{-}} = dx^{-} + \frac{1}{2}adx^{+} \quad \theta^{\hat{9}} = dx^9 \quad \theta^{\hat{i}} ,$$

where $\theta^{\hat{i}}$ is an x^{+} -dependent orthonormal coframe for the metric g_{ij} . The connection one-form is given by the first structure equation (23). Because $\theta^{\hat{i}}$ depend on x^{+} we need to introduce a matrix $V_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ to represent the variation of the coframe with respect to x^{+} . According to [6] for a conformal anti-self dual variation, the matrix $V_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ is symmetric: $V_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} = V_{\hat{j}\hat{i}}$. In this case, the nonzero components of the connection one-form are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i^{\hat{-}} &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_i a \theta^{\hat{+}} - V_{ij} \theta^{\hat{j}} \\ \omega_{\hat{9}}^{\hat{-}} &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\hat{9}} a \theta^{\hat{+}} , \end{aligned}$$

together with the x^{+} -dependent connection one-form $\omega_i^{\hat{j}}$ of the metric g_{ij} . The nonzero components of $\omega_{+}^{\hat{a}\hat{b}}$ are therefore $\omega_{+}^{\hat{i}\hat{-}}$ and $\omega_{+}^{\hat{9}\hat{-}}$. Since the spinor ε obeys $\Gamma_{\perp}\varepsilon = 0$, it follows that $\omega_{+}^{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\Gamma_{\hat{a}\hat{b}}\varepsilon = 0$, whence $\nabla_{+}\varepsilon = \partial_{+}\varepsilon$, as claimed.

If the variation does not obey (28), so that the matrix V has an skew-symmetric part, then the $\hat{i}\hat{j}$ components of the connection one-form

would be modified by the addition of $V_{[\hat{i}\hat{j}]} \theta^{\hat{+}}$. Therefore there would be another nonzero component $\omega_+^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$, which would spoil the argument.

In summary, ε is an x^+ -dependent doublet of parallel spinors on X_9 satisfying equation (59), and the condition $\Gamma_- \varepsilon = 0$ chooses one of the spinors in the doublet. The number of supersymmetries which this background preserves is then equal to the number of parallel spinors in X_9 . In other words, the same fraction ν of supersymmetry is preserved as in the case of vanishing F .

Finally, the Einstein equations of motion read

$$R_{++} = \frac{1}{6} \Phi_{\mu\nu\rho} \Phi^{\mu\nu\rho} . \quad (60)$$

Because Φ is parallel in X_9 , the right-hand side of this equation is actually only a function of x^+ . This equation can be used to constrain the function a .

In summary, the Bryant metric (27) with F given by (54), with Φ an x^+ -dependent parallel 3-form relative to the x^+ -dependent metric (55), is a supersymmetric bosonic vacuum of eleven-dimensional supergravity provided that the arbitrary function in the Einstein metric a is such that equation (60) is satisfied. This background preserves the same amount of supersymmetry as the purely gravitational background. Notice that the existence of a parallel 3-form rules out only one of the possible holonomy groups of the metric: the maximal one G in (13), since there are no parallel 3-forms on a nine-dimensional manifold X_9 with holonomy exactly $\text{Spin}(7)$. For any of the other groups in Table 2 there is always a parallel 3-form and hence supersymmetric bosonic vacua with $F \neq 0$ exist and preserve the fraction ν of the supersymmetry listed in that table.

6.2. Adding a gravitino. It is also possible to give a vacuum expectation value to the gravitino. In fact, as was done in [11] for the metric (29), one can try the Ansatz [21]

$$\psi_+ = \chi \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_a = 0 \quad \text{for } a \neq +. \quad (61)$$

In this Ansatz both the gravitino torsion and the gravitino energy-momentum tensor vanish. It also leads to trivial supercovariantisation of the spin connection and the four-form F . Therefore the equations of motion of F and of the metric are not altered, and neither is the supersymmetry variation of the gravitino. However we now have that the bosonic fields do transform under supersymmetry and that the gravitino is subject to the Rarita–Schwinger equation. Requiring supersymmetry demands that χ be a parallel spinor in X_9 , whereas the Rarita–Schwinger equation fixes the dependence of this spinor on x^+ .

7. CONCLUSIONS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

In this paper we have initiated a systematic analysis of possible supersymmetric bosonic M-theory vacua with zero four-form. As we have

seen there are two main types of vacua: static vacua which generalise the Kaluza–Klein monopole and non-static vacua generalising the M-wave. We have also seen how to obtain from these vacua other supersymmetric vacua with non-vanishing four-form.

A convenient invariant, which refines the more standard supersymmetry fraction, is the holonomy group of the metric defining the vacuum. The holonomy groups of the static vacua are the well-known riemannian holonomy groups admitting parallel spinors: they are given in Table 1. In contrast, the holonomy groups for the supersymmetric M-waves are lorentzian holonomy groups which have not been studied much. The indecomposable groups are listed in Table 2. The rest of the paper has been mostly devoted to the construction of supersymmetric M-waves with the holonomy groups in Table 2. The construction consists of warped products of lower dimensional supersymmetric (Brinkmann) *pp*-waves with riemannian manifolds admitting parallel spinors. In particular, all groups in the table can be obtained as holonomy groups of warped products of three-dimensional waves with eight-dimensional manifolds with holonomy contained in $\text{Spin}(7)$. The fractions of supersymmetry preserved by these vacua (both static and non-static) belong to the set $\{1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{16}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{3}{32}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{32}\}$. It is thus a natural question to ask whether some of these vacua are actually dual to vacua consisting of intersecting branes, where some of these same fractions occur.

Many of the metrics described here have spacelike isometries, along which the metric can be reduced dimensionally to a supersymmetric wave of type IIA string theory, of the type that has been much studied in the literature (see, for example, [3, 10, 9]). Many of these supersymmetric waves belong to a duality multiplet, which may contain other type IIA vacua which can be oxidised back to eleven dimensions. In this way we can construct dual vacua to the M-waves described in this paper. We believe that it is an interesting problem to investigate these dual vacua. Similarly, every supersymmetric M-wave possesses a null isometry. It would be very interesting to perform a null reduction [13] of these vacua and then try to dualise and oxidise back to eleven dimensions.

Finally, all the metrics we have discussed in this paper are *local*. We have not analysed the global (spatial or causal) structure of the spacetimes admitting these metrics. This is an interesting area for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sonia Stanciu contributed in the early stages of this work and it is my pleasure to thank her for that. It is also a pleasure to thank Chris Hull, Tomás Ortín and Arkady Tseytlin for useful discussions,

and especially Robert Bryant for sending me his notes on spinors and for much insightful correspondence.

APPENDIX A. SOME EXOTIC LORENTZIAN HOLONOMY GROUPS

In this appendix we collect some facts about the group G in equation (13) and some of its subgroups. More precisely we describe the Lie algebras and how they are embedded in the lorentzian spin algebra. As usual when discussing the representations of a spin algebra it is convenient to work with the Clifford algebra into which the spin algebra is embedded. The eleven-dimensional spin algebra $\mathfrak{so}(10, 1)$ is naturally embedded inside the Clifford algebras $Cl(10, 1)$ and $Cl(1, 10)$. We choose to work with the latter algebra. Our Clifford algebra conventions are as in [15]. In particular, the defining relations for $Cl(1, 10)$ are

$$\{\Gamma_A, \Gamma_B\} = 2\eta_{AB}\mathbb{1} ,$$

where η_{AB} is mostly plus. Since we want to be as explicit as possible, our first task is to find an explicit realisation of $Cl(1, 10)$.

A.1. An explicit real realisation of $Cl(1, 10)$. As a real associative algebra, $Cl(1, 10)$ is isomorphic to two copies of the algebra of real 32×32 matrices:

$$Cl(1, 10) \cong \text{Mat}(32, \mathbb{R}) \oplus \text{Mat}(32, \mathbb{R}) .$$

This means that there are precisely two inequivalent irreducible representations: both real and of dimension 32. Of course both representations are equivalent under the spin algebra $\mathfrak{so}(10, 1)$, and isomorphic to the spinor representation Δ . Choosing a set of generators $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_9, \Gamma_{\mathfrak{h}}$ for $Cl(1, 10)$, their product $\Gamma_{012\dots 9\mathfrak{h}}$ commutes with all Γ_A and squares to one. Hence by Schur's lemma it is $\pm\mathbb{1}$ on an irreducible representation. We will identify Δ with the irreducible representation of the Clifford algebra for which $\Gamma_{012\dots 9\mathfrak{h}}$ takes the value $-\mathbb{1}$. This means that $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_{1\dots 9\mathfrak{h}}$, where $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_9, \Gamma_{\mathfrak{h}}$ generate the ten-dimensional Clifford algebra $Cl(0, 10)$. The Clifford algebra $Cl(0, 10)$ is isomorphic to $Cl(8) \otimes Cl(0, 2)$, where the isomorphism is given explicitly as follows in terms of generators. Let Γ'_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$ denote the generators for $Cl(8)$ and let Γ''_1 and Γ''_2 denote the generators for $Cl(0, 2)$.

The Γ'_i can be constructed explicitly in terms of the octonions $\mathbb{O}$. The construction of the two irreducible representations of $Cl(7)$ in terms of octonions is well known: see, for example, [15]. Let $\{o_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, 7$, be a set of imaginary octonion units. Then left multiplication L_i and right multiplication R_i by o_i on $\mathbb{O}$ define the two inequivalent irreducible representations of the Clifford algebra $Cl(7)$. Either representation

can be used in order to build the unique irreducible representation of $\text{Cl}(8)$ —we choose L_i . Thus we define

$$\Gamma'_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & L_i \\ L_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 7; \text{ and } \Gamma'_8 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

yielding a manifestly real 16-dimensional representation of $\text{Cl}(8) \cong \text{Mat}(16, \mathbb{R})$.

As associative algebras, $\text{Cl}(0, 2) \cong \text{Mat}(2, \mathbb{R})$, so we can choose a basis

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma''_1 = \sigma_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Gamma''_2 = \sigma_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \therefore \Gamma''_3 = \Gamma''_1 \Gamma''_2 &= -i\sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the generators of $\text{Cl}(0, 10)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_0 &= \Gamma'_9 \otimes \Gamma''_3 & \Gamma_i &= \Gamma'_i \otimes \Gamma''_3 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, 8 \\ \Gamma_9 &= \mathbb{1} \otimes \Gamma''_2 & \Gamma_{\mathfrak{h}} &= \mathbb{1} \otimes \Gamma''_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma'_9 \equiv \Gamma'_1 \Gamma'_2 \cdots \Gamma'_8$. This decomposition induces an isomorphism $\Delta \cong \mathbb{R}^{16} \otimes \mathbb{R}^2$, so that we can write the eleven-dimensional spinors as two-component objects, each component being a sixteen-dimensional real spinor of $\text{Cl}(8)$. Therefore in terms of $\text{Cl}(8)$ generators we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\Gamma'_9 \\ \Gamma'_9 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Gamma_i &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\Gamma'_i \\ \Gamma'_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, 8 \\ \Gamma_9 &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} & \Gamma_{\mathfrak{h}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

The standard basis for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(10, 1) \subset \text{Cl}(1, 10)$ is given by $\Sigma_{AB} = -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{AB}$, which in the chosen realisation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma'_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma'_{ij} \end{pmatrix} & \Sigma_{i\mathfrak{h}} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_i & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_i \end{pmatrix} \\ \Sigma_{i9} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_i \\ -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Sigma_{0i} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_9 \Gamma'_i & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_9 \Gamma'_i \end{pmatrix} \\ \Sigma_{0\mathfrak{h}} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_9 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_9 \end{pmatrix} & \Sigma_{09} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_9 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'_9 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \Sigma_{9\mathfrak{h}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where Σ'_{ij} are the generators of $\mathfrak{so}(8) \subset \text{Cl}(8)$. In particular, notice that as mentioned above, the representation Δ breaks up under $\text{Spin}(8)$ as two copies each of the spinor representations. In more traditional notation, under the embedding $\text{Spin}(10, 1) \supset \text{Spin}(8)$, we have

$$\underline{\mathbf{32}} = 2 \underline{\mathbf{8}}_{\mathbf{s}} \oplus 2 \underline{\mathbf{8}}_{\mathbf{c}}. \tag{63}$$

A.2. The spinor isotropy group G . In this section we describe the non-reductive Lie subgroup $G \subset \text{Spin}(10, 1)$ in equation (13) which leaves a spinor invariant. We will exhibit its Lie algebra (and hence the Lie group itself) inside the Clifford algebra $\text{Cl}(1, 10)$ constructed above.

Consider a spinor ε of the form

$$\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+ \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (64)$$

where ψ_+ is a positive chirality spinor of $\text{Cl}(8)$; that is, $\Gamma'_9 \psi_+ = \psi_+$. The vector $v^A = \bar{\varepsilon} \Gamma^A \varepsilon$ obeys $v^i = v^9 = v^+ = 0$ and $v^- = -2\|\psi_+\|^2$, where $\|\psi_+\|^2 = \bar{\psi}_+ \psi_+$. Therefore the vector v and hence the spinor ε are null and by the discussion in Section 2.2 the spinor isotropy should be the group G in equation (13). Let us prove this. It is easy to compute the isotropy subalgebra $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{so}(10, 1)$ of ε from the explicit form of the generators of $\mathfrak{so}(10, 1)$ given above. After a little bit of algebra we obtain that the most general element of $\mathfrak{g}$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} a_{ij} \Sigma_{ij} + b_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu}, \quad (65)$$

where $\Gamma_- = \Gamma_0 - \Gamma_9$, b_μ ($\mu = 1, \dots, 9$) are arbitrary and a_{ij} ($i, j = 1, \dots, 8$) are such that the $\mathfrak{so}(8)$ element $\frac{1}{2} a_{ij} \Sigma'_{ij}$ actually belongs to the isotropy subalgebra of ψ_+ . Because $\text{Spin}(8)$ acts transitively on the unit sphere in both its spinor (as well as the vector) representations, the isotropy subalgebras of every spinor are conjugate, hence isomorphic. This implies that the isotropy subgroup of ψ_+ is a $\text{Spin}(7)$ subgroup: one which decomposes the positive chirality spinor representation of $\text{Spin}(8)$ but keeps the vector and the negative chirality representations irreducible. We call this subgroup $\text{Spin}^+(7)$ to distinguish it from the other two (conjugacy classes of) $\text{Spin}(7)$ subgroups of $\text{Spin}(8)$: $\text{Spin}(7)$, which leaves the spinor representations irreducible but splits the vector representation, and $\text{Spin}^-(7)$ which splits the negative chirality spinor representation but leaves the positive chirality and the vector representations irreducible. This means that $\frac{1}{2} a_{ij} \Sigma_{ij}$ belong to the $\mathfrak{so}^+(7)$ subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(8)$. Computing the Lie bracket of elements of the form (65), and using that Γ_- squares to zero, we obtain the following structure

$$\mathfrak{g} \cong (\mathfrak{so}^+(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R},$$

where $\mathbb{R}^8$ is abelian and $\mathfrak{so}^+(7)$ acts on it as a spinor. Notice that $\mathbb{R}$ is in the centre, and that $\mathbb{R}^8$ is an abelian ideal, whence this Lie algebra is not reductive. Exponentiating inside $\text{Cl}(1, 10)$ we obtain the simply-connected 30-dimensional non-reductive Lie subgroup $G \subset \text{Spin}(10, 1)$ given in equation (13):

$$G \cong (\text{Spin}^+(7) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^8) \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (66)$$

A.3. The group G as Lorentz transformations. To gain some intuition about the group G , we now investigate the action of G on Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{M}^{11}$. We will see that it is generated by rotations and null rotations and that it acts reducibly yet indecomposably. It is convenient to parametrise G , which as a manifold is diffeomorphic to $\text{Spin}(7) \times \mathbb{R}^9$, as follows:

$$\text{C}\ell(1, 10) \supset G \ni g = \exp(c_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu}) \sigma, \quad (67)$$

where $\sigma \in \text{Spin}^+(7)$ and μ runs from 1 to 9. Notice that the exponential only consists of two terms because $\Gamma_-^2 = 0$:

$$\exp(c_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu}) = 1 + c_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} c_\mu \Gamma_\mu \Gamma_-.$$

The composition of group elements follows the standard semidirect product structure:

$$\exp(c_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu}) \sigma \exp(d_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu}) \tau = \exp((c_\mu + \sigma \cdot d_\mu) \Sigma_{-\mu}) \sigma \tau,$$

where $\sigma, \tau \in \text{Spin}^+(7)$ and $c_\mu, d_\mu \in \mathbb{R}^9$.

Let $g \in G$ be as above. Its action on the basis $\{e_A\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g \cdot e_i &= \sigma \cdot e_i - \sigma^{-1} \cdot c_i e_- \\ g \cdot e_9 &= e_9 - c_9 e_- \\ g \cdot e_{\mathfrak{z}} &= e_{\mathfrak{z}} - c_\mu e_\mu + \frac{1}{2} c^2 e_- \\ g \cdot e_0 &= e_0 - c_\mu e_\mu + \frac{1}{2} c^2 e_-, \end{aligned}$$

where $c^2 = c_\mu c_\mu$. Notice that for nonzero c_μ exactly one null direction (e_-) is left invariant, so that the transformation is a null rotation. From these formulae above one can determine the space of G -invariant forms. The results are summarised in Table 6, where $\{e_A^*\}$ is a canonical dual basis to $\{e_A\}$, Ω is the Cayley form (the self-dual $\text{Spin}^+(7)$ -invariant 4-form), $\text{vol}_8 = e_1^* \wedge \cdots \wedge e_8^*$ and $\text{vol}_{11} = e_0^* \wedge e_1^* \wedge \cdots \wedge e_9^* \wedge e_{\mathfrak{z}}^*$ are the eight- and eleven-dimensional volume forms, respectively.

Decomposing the spinor representation Δ under $\text{Spin}^+(7)$, there are precisely two linearly independent $\text{Spin}^+(7)$ -invariant spinors. The null rotations in $\mathbb{R}^9$ preserve only one of them. Therefore G leaves invariant exactly one spinor (up to scale)—the spinor ε in (64), where ψ_+ is the $\text{Spin}^+(7)$ -invariant spinor in that representation.

A.4. Some relevant subgroups of G . Bryant [6] has shown that the Lie group G in equation (66) is a possible holonomy group for indecomposable eleven-dimensional lorentzian manifolds. There are other subgroups of G which are also possible holonomy groups and which still act indecomposably on $\mathbb{M}^{11}$. These subgroups $H \subset G$ are of the form

$$(K \ltimes \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^{9-d}, \quad (68)$$

Degree	Invariant forms
0	1
1	e_-^*
2	$e_-^* \wedge e_9^*$
5	$e_-^* \wedge \Omega$
6	$e_-^* \wedge e_9^* \wedge \Omega$
9	$e_-^* \wedge \text{vol}_8$
10	$e_-^* \wedge e_9^* \wedge \text{vol}_8$
11	vol_{11}

TABLE 6. G -invariant forms.

where $K \subset \text{Spin}^+(7) \cap \text{Spin}(d)$ is a possible holonomy group of a d -dimensional riemannian manifold. Such subgroups can be read off from Table 1, for $d \leq 8$.

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ of H , given by

$$(\mathfrak{k} \ltimes \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^{9-d},$$

is embedded in $\mathfrak{so}(10,1)$ according to equation (65) but where now $\frac{1}{2}a_{ij}\Sigma_{ij} \in \mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{so}^+(7) \cap \mathfrak{so}(d)$.

We choose to parametrise group elements $h \in H$ as in equation (67)

$$h = \exp(c_\mu \Sigma_{-\mu}) \sigma,$$

but where now $\sigma \in K$. The action of $h \in H$ on $\mathbb{M}^{11}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} h \cdot e_i &= \sigma \cdot e_i - \sigma^{-1} \cdot c_i e_- \\ h \cdot e_m &= e_m - c_m e_- \\ h \cdot e_{\mathfrak{q}} &= e_{\mathfrak{q}} - c_\mu e_\mu + \frac{1}{2}c^2 e_- \\ h \cdot e_0 &= e_0 - c_\mu e_\mu + \frac{1}{2}c^2 e_-, \end{aligned}$$

where $i = 1, \dots, d$ and $m = d+1, \dots, 9$.

We can compute the space of K -invariant forms as before. We will not be so explicit as to actually list the forms, but simply notice that the space of H -invariant forms on $\mathbb{M}^{11}$ is given in terms of the space of K -invariant forms on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by:

$$\left(\bigwedge \mathbb{M}^{11*} \right)^H \cong \mathbb{R}1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\text{vol}_{11} \oplus e_-^* \wedge \left(\bigwedge \mathbb{V} \otimes \left(\bigwedge \mathbb{R}^{d*} \right)^K \right), \quad (69)$$

where $\mathbb{V}$ is the subspace of $(\mathbb{M}^{11})^*$ spanned by the e_m^* for $m = d+1, \dots, 9$. For example, for $d = 7$ and $K = G_2$, the G_2 -invariant forms are 1, ϕ , $\star\phi$ and vol_7 , where ϕ is the associative 3-form and $\star\phi$ is its seven-dimensional dual: the co-associative 4-form. The H -invariant forms

are given in Table 7 below. One can write down similar tables for the other subgroups H , but we will not do so here.

Degree	Invariant forms
0	1
1	e_-^*
2	$e_-^* \wedge e_m^*$
3	$e_-^* \wedge e_8^* \wedge e_9^*$
4	$e_-^* \wedge \phi$
5	$e_-^* \wedge \phi \wedge e_m^*$, $e_-^* \wedge \star \phi$
6	$e_-^* \wedge \phi \wedge e_8^* \wedge e_9^*$, $e_-^* \wedge \star \phi \wedge e_m^*$
7	$e_-^* \wedge \star \phi \wedge e_8^* \wedge e_9^*$
8	$e_-^* \wedge \text{vol}_7$
9	$e_-^* \wedge \text{vol}_7 \wedge e_m^*$
10	$e_-^* \wedge \text{vol}_7 \wedge e_8^* \wedge e_9^*$
11	vol_{11}

TABLE 7. Forms on $\mathbb{M}^{11}$ invariant under $H = (G_2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^7) \times \mathbb{R}^2$. Here m takes the values 8 and 9.

The action on the eleven-dimensional spinor representation Δ can be worked out from the explicit expression (65) as before. Decomposing Δ under the group K we find $2N_K$ parallel spinors, where $N_K = 1$ for $K = \text{Spin}^+(7)$, $N_K = 2$ for $K = \text{SU}(4)$ and G_2 , $N_K = 3$ for $K = \text{Sp}(2)$, $N_K = 4$ for $K = \text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(1)$ and $\text{SU}(3)$, $N_K = 8$ for $K = \text{Sp}(1)$ and $N_K = 16$ for $K = \{1\}$. The null rotations in H preserve precisely one half of these spinors, whence H leaves invariant precisely N_K spinors. This gives rise to the supersymmetry fractions $\nu \equiv \frac{1}{32}N_K$ in Table 2.

REFERENCES

- [1] BS Acharya, JM Figueroa-O'Farrill, B Spence, and S Stanciu, *Planes, branes and automorphisms: II. Branes in motion*, JHEP **07** (1998), 005, hep-th/9805176.
- [2] L Bérard Bergery and A Ikemakhen, *On the holonomy of lorentzian manifolds*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **54** (1993), 27–40.
- [3] EA Bergshoeff, R Kallosh, and T Ortín, *Supersymmetric string waves*, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993), 5444–5452, hep-th/9212030.
- [4] AL Besse, *Einstein manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [5] HW Brinkmann, *Einstein spaces which are mapped conformally on each other*, Math. Ann. **94** (1925), 119–145.
- [6] RL Bryant, *Remarks on spinors in low dimension*, Unpublished notes, 1998.

- [7] E Cremmer, B Julia, and J Scherk, *Supergravity in eleven dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **76B** (1978), 409–412.
- [8] MJ Duff, BEW Nilsson, and CN Pope, *Kaluza–Klein supergravity*, Phys. Rep. **130** (1986), 1–142.
- [9] C Gabriel, P Spindel, and M Rومان, *Chiral supersymmetric pp-wave solutions of IIA supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B415** (1997), 54–62, hep-th/9709142.
- [10] GT Horowitz and AA Tseytlin, *A new class of exact solutions in string theory*, Phys. Rev. **D51** (1995), 2896–2917, hep-th/9409021.
- [11] CM Hull, *Exact pp wave solutions of eleven-dimensional supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **139B** (1984), 39–41.
- [12] ———, *Killing spinors and exact plane wave solutions of extended supergravity*, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984), 334–338.
- [13] B Julia and H Nicolai, *Null Killing vector dimensional reduction and galilean geometrodynamics*, Nucl. Phys. **B439** (1995), 291.
- [14] D Kramer, D Stephani, MAH MacCallum, and E Herlt, *Exact solutions of Einstein’s field equations*, Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- [15] HB Lawson and ML Michelsohn, *Spin geometry*, Princeton University Press, 1989.
- [16] JE Lidsey, *The embedding of superstring backgrounds in Einstein gravity*, Phys. Lett. **B417** (1998), 33.
- [17] W Nahm, *Supersymmetries and their representations*, Nucl. Phys. **B135** (1978), 149–166.
- [18] C Nappi and E Witten, *A WZW model based on a non-semi-simple group*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993), 3751–3753, hep-th/9310112.
- [19] G De Rham, *Sur la réductibilité d’un espace de Riemann*, Comm. Math. Helv. **26** (1952), 328–344.
- [20] AA Tseytlin, *String vacuum backgrounds with covariantly constant null Killing vector and 2-d quantum gravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B390** (1993), 153–172, hep-th/9209023.
- [21] LF Urrutia, *A new exact solution of classical supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **102B** (1981), 393–396.
- [22] H Wu, *On the de Rham decomposition theorem*, Illinois J. Math. **8** (1964), 291–311.

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS
 QUEEN MARY AND WESTFIELD COLLEGE
 LONDON E1 4NS, UK

E-mail address: j.m.figueroa@qmw.ac.uk